

THE
PRINCIPLES
OF THE
Cyprianic Age,

With Regard to
Episcopal Power and Jurisdiction :

Asserted and Recommended from the *Genuine Writings*
of *St. Cyprian* himself, and his Contemporaries.

By which it is made evident, That the Vindicator
of the Kirk of *Scotland* is obliged by his own Concessions
to acknowledge, that *he* and *his Associates* are *Schismatics*.

In a Letter to a F R I E N D.

By *J. S.*

L O N D O N,

Printed for *Walter Kettilby* at ~~the~~ *Bishop's Head* in *St. Paul's*
Church-yard. MDCXCV.

THE
PRINCIPLES
OF THE
ECONOMY

OF THE

PRINCIPLES OF THE ECONOMY

OF THE ECONOMY

OF THE ECONOMY

OF THE ECONOMY

OF THE ECONOMY

OF THE ECONOMY

Sanctissimæ Matri Ecclesiæ SCOTICANÆ,
Sub pondere pressæ,
Sed & adhuc malis non cedenti,
Fidem Catholicam, Unitatem Apostolicam, Pietatem primævam
Fortiter propugnanti :

Adversus Blasphemias, Calumnias, Sacrilegia, & Ruinas,
Invioto (quia verè Christiano) animo
Strenuè decertanti :

Cultu, Fide, & Justitiâ,
In Deum, Regem, & proximos
Conspiciat :

Hæreses omnes, tam antiquas quam novas,
Armis Evangelicis, & perpetuâ Ecclesiæ traditione
Profliganti :

Undique Lachrymis suffusâ,
Victrice tamen Cruce triumphanti ;
(Tam Archiepiscopis, Episcopis, Presbyteris, & Diaconis,
Quam universo Fidelium Cœtui,
Veris suis Pastoribus vinculo *Eurythias* primigeniæ,
Adhærescenti)

Solâ spe Cœlestis præmii, inter clades miseras & maximas,
Suffultæ ;

Hanc dissertationem Epistolarem (raptim & sermone
Vernaculo conscriptam) de Episcoporum ævi Cyprianici

Eminentia & Prærogativis,
Eâ quâ par est animi modestiâ & reverentiâ,
Clientelæ & Censuræ ergo

D. D. D.

2 ANGLICANAE ALIUM ECCLESIAE SCOTICANA

sub pondere pressi
sed & ad hunc nulli non constant
Fidem Catholicam Unitatemque doctrinae
Fideliter propagant
Adversus Heterodoxas Calvinisticas Sacrasque & Romanas
Invasiones (quae veris Christianis) annuo
sermone decernunt
Colum. Tit. & Ioh. III.
In Danti Regem & p. 10
Conferunt
Iuxta omnes res antiquas quae novae
Annis Evangelicis & perperam Fidei traditionibus
Fideliter
Unitatem doctrinae & fidei
Virtutes omnes Christianitatis
(Tam Anglicanae, Episcopalis, Presbyterialis & Methodisticae)
Cuiusmodi fides in
Iuxta hanc doctrinam & fidei
Adversus
Sed spe Catholicis praeferunt, inter ceteros nullum & maxime
Sed
Hanc doctrinam & fidei
Virtutes omnes (quae veris Christianis)
Unitatem & doctrinam
Et per ea quae ad hunc modum de reverentia
Christianis de Cantu. c. 60
D. D. D.

THE
PRINCIPLES
OF THE
Cyprianic Age, &c.

SIR,

I Acknowledge you have performed your Promise. The Author of the *Defence of the Vindication of the Church of Scotland, in Answer to an Apology OF* (he should have said *FOR*) *the Clergy of Scotland*, has indeed said so as you affirmed: And I ask your Pardon for putting you to the trouble of sending me his Book and Pointing to *Self. 39. Page 34.* where he has said so. But now, after all, what tho he has said so? And said so, so boldly? Do you think his bare saying so is enough to determine our Question? Don't mistake it. That which made me so backward to believe he had said so, was not any dreadful Apprehension I had of either his Reason or Authority; but a Perswasion that none of his Party would have been so rash, as to have put their being or not being *Schismatics* upon such a desperate Issue. And that you may not apprehend my Perswasion was unreasonable, I shall first take to Task what he hath said; and then, perchance, add something concerning our main Argument. His Words are these.

Arg. 5. Cyprian's Notion of Schism is, when one separateth from his own Bishop. This the Presbyterians do: Ergo. A. All

B

the

The Principles of

the strength of this Argument lieth in the sound of Words. A Bishop, in Cyprian's time, was not a Diocesan, with sole Power of Jurisdiction and Ordination. If he prove that, we shall Give Cyprian and him leave to call us Schismaticks. A Bishop, then, was the Pastor of a Flock, or the Moderator of a Presbytery. If he can prove, that we separate from our Pastors, or from the Presbytery, with their Moderator, under whose Inspection we ought to be, let him call us what he will: But we disown the Bishops in Scotland from being our Bishops; we can neither own their Episcopal Authority, nor any Pastoral Relation that they have to us. Thus he.

Now, Sir, if one had a mind to catch at Words, what a Field might he have here? For Instance; Suppose the Word *Diocess* was not in use in St. Cyprian's time, as applied to a particular Bishop's *Distric*t; Doth it follow, that the Thing now signified by it, was not then to be found? Again; What could move him to insinuate, that we assign the *sole Power of Jurisdiction and Ordination* to our *Diocesan Bishop*? When did our Bishops *claim* that *sole Power*? When was it ascribed to them by the Constitution? When did any of our Bishops attempt to Exercise it? When did a *Scotish Bishop* offer, *e. g.* to *Ordain* or *Depose* a Presbyter, without the Concurrence of other Presbyters? When was such a *sole Power* deem'd *Necessary* for Raising a Bishop to all the due Elevations of the Episcopal Authority? How easie is it to distinguish between a *Sole* and a *Chief Power*? Between a *Power Superiour* to all other *Powers*, and a *Power Exclusive* of all other *Powers*? Between a *Power*, without, or against which, no other *Powers* can Act; tho' they may, in Conjunction with it, or Subordination to it: And a *Power*, destroying all other *Powers*, or disabling them from Acting? Once more, How loose and Ambiguous is that part of his Definition of a Bishop, in St. Cyprian's time, in which he calls him, *The Pastor of a Flock*? May not a Bishop, and his Diocess, be called a *Pastor* and a *Flock*, in as great propriety of Speech, as a *Presbyterian Minister* and his *Parish*? Sure I am, St. Cyprian and his Contemporaries thought so, as you may learn hereafter.

How easie were it, I say, for one to insist on such Escapes, if he had a mind for it? But I love not Jangle; and I must avoid:

avoid Prolixity: And therefore considering the State of the Controversie between our Author and the Apologist, and supposing he intended (however he expressed it) to speak home to the Apologist's Argument; the Force and Purpose of his Answer, as I take it, must be this.

"That an Argument drawn from such as were called Bishops in St. Cyprian's time, to such as are now so called in Scotland, is not good. That a Bishop, in St. Cyprian's time, was nothing like one of our modern *Scottish* Bishops; *i. e.* a Church Governour superiour to, and having a Prelatick Power over, all other Church-Governours within such a Diocese. That a Bishop then was no more than a *single Presbyter*, or *Pastor* of a *single Flock*, (such a Flock as could conveniently meet together in one Assembly, for the Publick Offices of Religion; such a Flock as the People of one single Parish are, in the modern Presbyterian Notion of a Parish,) acting in *Parity* with other *single Pastors* of other *single Flocks* or Parishes. Or, at most, That he was but the *Moderator* of a *Presbytery*, taking both Terms in the modern current Presbyterian Sense; *i. e.* as *Moderator* signifies One, who, as such, is no Church-Governour, nor hath any Jurisdiction over his Brethren: One, whose Power is merely Ordinate, not Decisive; To be the Mouth of the Meeting, not to be their Will or Commanding Faculty: To keep Order in the Manner and Managing of what cometh before them; Not to Determine what is Debated amongst them. And as *Presbytery* signifies such a Number of *Teaching* and *Ruling* Presbyters living and having their Cures within such a Diocese; meeting together upon Occasion, and acting in *Parity* in the Administration of the Government, and Discipline of the Church. That therefore our *Scottish Presbyterians* cannot be called *Schismatics* in St Cyprian's Notion of *Schism*, unless it can be proved, That they Separate from their Pastor, or *Teaching Presbyter*, who has such a Parish assigned to him for his Charge: Or, (not from the *Moderator* of the *Presbytery*, who is not; but) from the *Presbytery* (which is the Principle of Unity) with their *Moderator*.

This, I say, I take to be the Purpose of our Author's Answer to the Apologist's Argument; on the Force whereof he ventures his Parties being, or not being, *Schismatics*. If I

The Principles of

^a *Ad Quest. 1.*
Sect. 5.

have mistaken his Meaning, I protest I have not done it wilfully. I am pretty sure, I have not, in the Definition of a Moderator; for I have Transcribed it, Word for Word, from one whom I take to be a dear Friend of his, intirely of the same Principles and Sentiments with him; and whose Definitions, I am apt to think, he will not readily Reject. I mean, the Author of *The Vindication of the Church of Scotland, in Answer to the Ten Questions*^a. And doth not our Author himself, in this same 39th Section, (part whereof I am now considering,) affirm, That *Fifty Years before the first Council of Nice, (i. e. some 17 or 18 Years after St Cyprian's Martyrdom,) the Hierarchy was not in the Church?* And that however some of the Names might have been, yet the Church-Power and Dominion, signified by them, was not then in Being? Plainly importing, that the Church then was Governed by Pastors acting in Parity, after the Presbyterian Model. In short, what our Author hath said, when duly considered, will be found to be no Answer at all to the Apologist's Argument, if it is not to be understood in the Sense I have represented.

Taking it for granted, therefore, that I have hit his Meaning, I hope you will not deny, that, If I shall prove that a Bishop, in Cyprian's time, was more than a Pastor of a Flock, or the Moderator of a Presbytery, in the Presbyterian Sense of the Terms: If I shall prove, that a Bishop then had really that which cannot be denied to have been true, Genuine Episcopal or Prelatick Power: If I can prove, that he acted in a Real Superiority over, not in Parity with other Church-Governours, even Pastors: If I shall prove these Things, I say, I hope you'll grant, our Author is fairly bound by his Word to acknowledge, that he and his Brethren Presbyterians are Schismatics. Let us try it then: And now, Sir,

Before I come to my main Proofs, consider if it may not be deemed a shrewd Presumption against our Author in this matter, That generally the great Champions for Presbytery, such as Chamier, Blondel, Salmasius, the Provincial Assembly of London, &c. do ingenuously acknowledge, That, long before St. Cyprian's time, Episcopacy was in the Church; even Spanhemius himself grants, That, in the Third Century, Bishops had a manifest Prebeminence above Presbyters and

Dea-

Deacons, and a *Right of Presiding, Convocating, Ordaining^b, &c.* By the way: I have cited this Writer particularly, because our Author not only builds much on his Authority^c, but he honours him with the great Character of being *That diligent Searcher into Antiquity*. How deservedly, let others judge; for my part, I cannot think he has been so very diligent a Searcher: For in that same very Section, in which he acknowledges the Episcopal Preheminence in the Third Century, he says expressly, That, in that Age, there were no *Door-keepers*, *Acolyths*, nor *Exorcists^d*. And yet I not only find express mention of *Exorcism* in the Venerable Council of *Carthage*, in which *St. Cyprian* was *Præses^e*; But both *Cyprian* and *Firmilian* expressly mention *Exorcists^f*. And as for *Acolyths*, how often do we find them mentioned in *Cyprian's* Epistles? *E. g.* We have *Narivus* an *Acolyth*, Ep. 7. *Favorinus*, Ep. 34. *Nicephorus*, Ep. 45. *Saturnus*, and *Felicianus*, Ep. 59. *Lucanus*, Ep. 77. And doth not *Cornelius* Bishop of *Rome*, in his famous Epistle to *Fabius* Bishop of *Antioch*, Recorded by *Eusebius^g*, positively affirm, That there were then in the Church of *Rome* 42 *Acolyths*, and 52 *Exorcists*, *Lectors*, and *Door-keepers*? But this, as I said, only by the way.

That which I am concerned about at present, is, That when these great Patrons of *Presbytery*, these truly Learned Men, whom I named, have all so frankly yielded, that there was real *Prelacy* in the Church in, and before, *St. Cyprian's* time; yet our Author should affirm, so boldly, that there was no such Thing: That there was no *Hierarchy* in the Church then, nor for many Years after. Has our Author been a more diligent Searcher into *Antiquity*, than those great *Antiquaries* were, that he was thus able to contradict their Discoveries? I am not apt to believe it. However, as I said, let this pass only for a Presumption against him. I proceed to other Arguments. And,

1. I observe, that, in *St. Cyprian's* time, every Church all the World over, at least, every Church, Constituted and Organized, according to the Principles which then prevailed, had a *Bishop*, *Presbyters*, and *Deacons*, by whom she was Ruled.

Thus,

^b *Episcoporum manifesta ubique Presencia seu jure presendi, Convocandi, Ordinandi, &c. Epist. Isag. ad Hist. Eccles. Nov. Test. Sac. 3. Sect. 6. pag. milt, 117.*
^c *Sect. 32. p. 28.*
^d *Sed nec hujus avi Ordines Minores, quales Copiatorum, Acolythorum, Exorcistarum. p. 119.*
^e *Suffrag. 1, 8, 31, 37.*
^f *Ep. 23. p. 49. Ep. 69. p. 187. Ep. 75. p. 223.*
^g *Hist. Eccl. lib. 6. cap. 43.*

^b Presbyteri
& Diaconi in
Adrumetina
Consistentes,
Polycarpo
Co-episcopo no-
stro absente, ig-
norabant quid
nobis in Com-
mune placuis-
set. &c. Ep. 49.
p. 91.

ⁱ Ep. 43.

^k Ep. 59.

Thus, for Example, we find express Mention of the Bishop, Presbyters, and Deacons, of the Church of *Adrumetum*^b; for *Cyprian* tells *Cornelius*, That when *He* and *Liberalis* came to that City, *Polycarpus* the Bishop was absent, and the Presbyters and Deacons were ignorant of what had been Resolved on by the Body of the *African* Bishops, about writing to the Church of *Rome*, till the Controversie between *Cornelius* and *Novatianus* should be more fully understood.

Thus *Cyprian* was Bishop of *Carthage*, and at the same time there were, in that City, 8 Presbyters at fewest: For we read of three, *Rogatianus*, *Britius*, and *Numidicus*, who adhered to himⁱ. And five who took part with *Felicissimus* against him, when that Deacon made his Schism^k. I hope I need not be at pains to prove, that there were Deacons then in that famous Church.

Thus *Cornelius*, in the afore-mentioned Epistle to *Fabius*, tells him, That while himself was Bishop of *Rome*, there were in that City no fewer than 46 Presbyters, and 7 Deacons, &c. A most flourishing Clergy, as St. *Cyprian* calls it^l. Whoso pleases, may see the like Account of the Church of *Alexandria*, in the same Times, in *Eusebius*^m. Indeed,

If we may believe St. *Cyprian*, there was no Church then without a Bishop: For from this Supposition, as an uncontroverted Matter of Fact, he Reasons against *Novatianus*ⁿ. His Argument is, That there is but One Church, and One Episcopacy, all the World over; and that Catholick and Orthodox Bishops were regularly planted in every Province and City, and therefore *Novatianus* could not but be a Schismatick, who, contrary to Divine Institution, and the Fundamental Laws of Unity, laboured to super-induce false Bishops into these Cities, where True and Orthodox Bishops were already planted. And he Reasons again upon the same Supposition, in the beginning of his 63d Epistle directed to *Caecilius*, concerning the Cup in

ⁿ Cum sit, a Christo, una Ecclesia, per totum Mundum, in multa Membra divisa, item Episcopatus unus Episcoporum multorum Concordi Numerestate Diffusus; ille, post Dei traditionem, post connexam & ubique conjunctam Catholicæ Ecclesiæ Unitatem, humanam conetur Ecclesiam facere, & per plurimas Civitates, novos Apostolos suos mittat, ut quadam recentia institutionis suæ fundamenta constituat; cumque jampridem per OMNES PROVINCIAS & per URBES SINGULAS, Ordinati sint Episcopi, in ætate antiqui, in fide integri, in pressura probati, in persecutione proscripti, ille super eos arcare alios pseudo-episcopos audeat. Ep. 55. p. 112.

the Eucharist^o. From this Supposition, I say, as from an uncontested Matter of *Fact*, he Reasons, in both Cases, which is a Demonstration, not only of the Credibility of his Testimony, but that the Matter of *Fact* was then so Notorious, as to be undeniable. He Reason'd from it, as from an acknowledged *Postulate*.

2. I observe, that the Presbyters, who, in these Times, were contra-distinguished from the Bishop and Deacons, were *Priests*, in the Language which was then current; *Pastors*, in the present Presbyterian Dialect, i. e. not *Ruling Elders*, but such as laboured in the Word and Sacraments. They were such as were honoured with the *Divine Priesthood*; such as were Constituted in the Clerical Ministry; such as whose Work it was to attend the *Altar* and the *Sacrifices*, and offer up the *Publick Prayers*, &c. as we find in the Instance of *Germaninus Faustinus*^p. Such as God, in his merciful Providence, was pleased to raise to the Glorious Station of the *Priesthood*, as in the Case of *Numidicus*^q. Such as in the time of *Persecution* went to the Prisons, and gave the *Holy Eucharist* to the *Confessors*^r. Such as at *Carthage* (as *St. Cyprian* complains to *Cornelius*) presumed to curtail the Penances of the *Lapsed*, and gave them the *Holy Sacrament* while their *Idolatry* was so very recent, that, as it were, their Hands and Mouths were still a smocking with the warm *Nidors* of the *Sacrifices* that had been offered upon the *Devils Altars*^s. Such as, contrary to all Rule and Order, absolved the *Lapsed*, and gave them the *Communion*, without the *Bishops Licence*^t. Such as were joyned with the Bishop in the *Sacerdotal Honour*^u. In a word, They were such Presbyters as *St. Cyprian* describes to *Stephen* Bishop of *Rome*; such as sometimes raised *Altar* against *Altar*, and (out of the *Communion* with the Church) offered *False and Sacrilegious Sacrifices*: Such as were to be *Deposed* when they did so; such as, tho' they should return to the *Communion* of the Church, were only to be admired to *LAY-COMMUNION*, and not to be allowed, there after, to act as Men in *Holy Orders*; seeing it became the *PRIESTS* and Ministers of God; those who attend the *Altar* and *Sacrifices*, to be Men of Integrity, and Blame.

^p Ep. 15, 16, 17. ^q *facti*. ^r Ep. 61. p. 144.

Adiungimus plane & adiungimus, Praeter carissime, Consensu & Auctoritate communi, ut etiam si qui Presbyteri—

Contra Altare unum atque divinum, Sacrificia, foris,

falsa & Sacrilega offerre conati sint, eos quoque hac conditione suscipi, cum revertuntur, ut
COMMUNICENT LAICI — Nec debere eos revertentes, ea, apud nos, Ordinationis & Honoris arma retinere, quibus contra nos Rebellerunt: Oportet enim
SACERDOTES — qui Altari & Sacrificiis deserviunt, integros atque immaculatos esse, &c. Ep. 72. p. 197.

less. Such Presbyters they were, I say, who were then, contra-distinguished from the Bishop: For, as for your *Lay-Elders*, your *Ruling*, contra-distinct from *Teaching*, *Presbyters*, now so much in vogue; there is as profound a Silence of them in *St. Cyprian's Works* and *Time*, as there is of the *Salem League* and *Covenant*, or *The Sanguinar Declaration*: And yet, considering how much he has left upon Record about the Governours, the Government, and the Discipline of the Church, if there had been such Presbyters, then, it is next to a Miracle that he should not, so much as once, have mentioned them.

3. I observe, that the Bishops Power, his Authority, his Pastoral Relation, (call it as you will,) extended to all the Christians within his District. E. g. *Cornelius* was immediately and directly *Superiour* to all the Christians in *Rome*, and they were his *Subject*. So it was also with *Fabius*, and the Christians of *Antioch*; *Dionysius*, and the Christians of *Alexandria*; *Cyprian*, and the Christians of *Carthage*, &c. The Bishops prelation, whatever it was, related not solely to the Clergy, or solely to the Laity, but to both, equally and formally. How fully might this Point be proved, if it were needful? Indeed, *St. Cyprian* defines a Church to be *A People united to their Priest*, and *A Flock adhering to their Pastor*. And that by the Terms *Priest* and *Pastor*, he meant the *Bishop*, is plain from what immediately follows; for he tells *Florentius Pupianus* there, That from that common and received Notion of a Church, he ought to have learned, *That the Bishop is in the Church, and the Church in the Bishop*; and that *who is not with the Bishop, is not in the Church*.

Christo sunt Ecclesia, plebs Sacerdoti adunata, & pastori suo Grex adherens. Unde scire debes Episcopum in Ecclesia esse, & Ecclesiam in Episcopo, & si qui cum Episcopo non sint, in Ecclesia non esse. Ep. 66. p. 168.

And in that same Epistle, chastising the same *Florentius* for calling his Title to his Bishoprick in question, and speaking bitter Things against him, he Reasons thus: *What Swelling of Pride? What Arrogance of Spirit? What Haughtiness is this?*

This

the Cyprianic Age.

9

That thou shouldest arraign Bishops before thy Tribunal? And, unless we be Purged by thee, and Absolved by thy Sentence, Lo! these Six Years, The BROTHERHOOD has had no BISHOP; The PEOPLE no RULER; The FLOCK no PASTOR; The CHURCH no GOVERNOUR; CHRIST no PRELATE; And GOD no PRIEST? In short, He that bore the high Character of Bishop, in St. Cyprian's time, was called the Ruler of the Church by way of Eminence¹. The Church was compared to a Ship, and the Bishop was the Master². He was the Father, and all the Christians within his District were his Children³. He was the Governour⁴, the Rector⁵, the Captain⁶, the Head⁷, the Judge⁸, all within his Diocess. He was the chief Pastor; and thò Presbyters were also sometimes called Pastors, yet it was but seldom; and, at best, they were but such in Subordination. Indeed, the Presbyters of the Church of Rome, during the Vacancy between Fabianus his Death and Cornelius his Promotion, look'd only on themselves as Vice-Pastors, saying, That, in such a juncture, they kept the Flock in STEAD of the Pastor, the Bishop⁹. I could give you even a Surfeit of Evidences, I say, for the Truth of this Proposition, if it were needful. Who so reads St. Cyprian's Epistles, may find it in almost every Page. And I shall have occasion hereafter to insist on many Arguments in the Probation of other Things, which may further clear this also. Indeed, there is no more in all this, than Ignatius said frequently, near 150 Years before St. Cyprian¹⁰.

tem? Ibid. p. 167. ¹ Præpositus, passim. ² Christi adversarius, & Ecclesie ejus inimicus. ad hoc Ecclesie præpositum sua infestatione prosequitur, ut Gubernatore sublato, atrocitus atque violentius circa Ecclesie Naufragia Grassetur. Ep. 59. p. 130. Vide etiam Ep. 30. p. 56. ³ Ep. 41. p. 79. ⁴ Gubernator, passim. ⁵ Rector. Ep. 59. p. 133. ⁶ Dux. Ep. 60. p. 141. ⁷ Caput. Ep. 45. p. 86. ⁸ Judex. Ep. 59. p. 129. ⁹ Et cum incumbat nobis qui videmur præpositi esse, & VICE PASTORIS custodire Gregem, &c. ¹⁰ Οπὲ αὐτῶν ὁ Ἐπίσκοπος καὶ τὸ πᾶν τῆς ἐκκλησίας. Ignat. ad Smyrn. Edit. Lond. 1680. p. 6. Χρῆς τε τῶν (Episcopo, nempe, Presbyteris & Diaconis.) ἐκκλησία ἡ καλεῖται. Ad Trall. p. 48. & passim.

And now, Sir, thò the Monuments of the Cyprianic Age could afford us no more than these three Things which I have proved from them, they would be of sufficient force to overthrow our Author's Definition of a Bishop in St. Cyprian's

C

time,

The Principles of

time, as to both Parts of it; and demonstrate to every thinking Man's conviction, That he was neither *The Pastor of the Flock*, nor *The Moderator of a Presbytery*, in our Author's sense of the Terms.

1. Not the *Pastor of a Flock*, i.e. a *single Presbyter*, having the Charge of a *single Parish*, after the Presbyterian Model: For, a Bishop, in those Times, had many such Presbyters under him. *Cyprian* himself (whatever he had more) had no fewer than Eight under him in the City of *Carthage*, besides the adjacent Villages. *Cornelius* was over Forty six in the City of *Rome*. I know not how many *Dionysius* was over at *Alexandria*, or *Polycarpus* at *Adenmetum*; but it is certain, they were in the Plural Number. So it was all the Christian World over, as I have proved. A Bishop then, in St. *Cyprian's* time, was a *Pastor* indeed, but it was of a *Dioecesis*, i.e. all the Christians within such a *District* were his *Flock*; and he had a direct, formal, and immediate *Pastoral Relation* to them all, tho' at the same time, within the same *District*, there were many *inferior Pastors* who were subordinate and subject to him.

2. He was as little a meer *Moderator of a Presbytery*, in our Author's sense of the Terms. A Presbyterian Moderator, as such, is no Church-Governour at all: A Bishop, in St. *Cyprian's* time, as such, was chief Pastor, Judge, Head, Master, Rector, Governour, of all the Christians within his *District*. A Presbyterian Moderator, as such, has no direct, immediate, formal Relation to the People, but only to the Presbytery. He is the Mouth, and keeps Order in the manner and managing of the Affairs of the Presbytery, not of the Church, or rather Churches, within the Bounds of that Presbytery. But a Bishop, in St. *Cyprian's* time, was quite another thing: His Prelacy, whatever it was, related to the Laity, as well as to the Clergy. St. *Cyprian's*, e.g. to as many Christians as required the subordinate Labours of, at least, Eight Presbyters: *Cornelius's* to as many as required the subordinate Labours of Forty Six: To a Body of Christians, in which, besides Forty six Presbyters, Seven Deacons, Seven Sub-Deacons, Forty two Acolytes, Fifty two Exorcists, Lectors and Door-keepers, there were more than Fifteen hundred Widows and poor People who subsisted by Charity: And, besides all these, a mighty and innumerable Laity, as him-

himself words it¹. These Things, I say, might be sufficient in all Reason to confute our Author's Notion. But then, this is not all, for let us consider,

Μετὰ ταῦτα
ἐν τῇ ἀνακρίσει
ἐν τῇ λαῶν,
Apud Eufb.
H. E. Lib. 6.
chap. 43.

II. How a Bishop, in St. Cyprian's time, was Promoted to his Chair, to that sublime Top of the Priesthood (as he calls it)². And we shall easily collect another Demonstration against our Author's Notion. For, by the Principles of those Times, it was plain,

Sacerdotii
sublime fasti-
gium. Ep. 55.
p. 103.

1. That there could be no Lawful nor Allowable Promotion of One to a Bishoprick which had been Possessed before, unless there was a Clear, Canonical, and Unquestionable Vacancy. It was a received Maxim then, That there could be but one Bishop at once in a Church. When a See was once Canonically filled, whosoever else pretended to be Bishop of that See, was not a second Bishop, but none at all, in St. Cyprian's Judgment¹. Nay, he was so far from reckoning of him as another Bishop, that he deemed him not a Christian^m. Innumerable are his Testimonies to this purposeⁿ. But I shall Transcribe only One from Ep. 69. because he fully reasons the Case in it. There was a Controversie between Cornelius and Novatianus, whether was Bishop of Rome. Now, consider how St. Cyprian decides it. The Church is one (says he); and this one Church cannot be both within and without: If, therefore, the True Church is with Novatianus, She was not with Cornelius. But if She was with Cornelius, who succeeded to Bishop Fabianus by lawful Ordination, and whom God honoured with Martyrdom, as well as with the Episcopal Dignity, Novatianus is not in the Church; nor can he be acknowledged as a Bishop, who contemning the Evangelical and Apostolical Tradition, and succeeding to none, hath sprung from himself, He can by no means either have or hold a Church, who is not Ordained in the Church; for the Church cannot be without Herself, nor divided against Herself, &c. And a little after, Our Lord recommending to us the Unity which is of Divine Institution, saith, I and my Father are One; and again, Obliging the Church to keep this Unity, he saith, There shall be One Flock, and One Pastor: But if the Flock is One, How can he be reputed to be of the Flock, who is not numbred with the Flock? Or how can he be deem'd a Pastor, who (while the True Pastor lives and rules the Flock by a suc-

Et cum post
primum secun-
dus esse non
possit, quisquis
post unum, qui
solus esse de-
beat, factus
est, non jam
ille secundus
sed nullus est.
Ep. 55. p. 104.
^m Quisquis ille
est & qualif-
cunque est,
Christianus
non est. Ep. 55.
p. 112. fusi.
ⁿ Ep. 44. p. 86.
Ep. 45. p. 86.
Ep. 46. p. 89.
Ep. 59. p. 130.
Ep. 61. p. 144.
Ep. 68. p. 177.
Ep. 69. p. 184.
Un. Eccl. p. 110.

daneous Ordination) succeeds to none, but begins from himself? Such an one is an Alien, is Profane, is an Enemy to Christian Peace and Unity. He dwells not in the House of God, i. e. in the Church of God: None can dwell there but the Sons of Concord and Unanimity°.

° Ecclesia enim una est, quæ una & intus esse & foris, non potest. Si enim apud Novatianum est, apud Cornelium non fuit. Si vera apud Cornelium fuit, qui Fabiano Episcopo, Legitima Ordinatione successit, & quem, præter Sacerdotii honorem, Martyrio quoque Dominus Glorificavit, Novatianus in Ecclesia non est, nec Episcopus computari potest, qui, Evangelica & Apostolica Traditione contempta, nemini succedens, a seipso Ortus est: Habere namque aut tenere Ecclesiam nullo modo potest qui Ordinatus in Ecclesia non est: Foris enim non esse Ecclesiam, nec scindi adversum se, &c. Et paulo post, Idcirco Dominus insinuans nobis Unitatem de Divina Auctoritate venientem, ponit & Dicit, Ego & Pater unum sumus: Ad quam unitatem redigens Ecclesiam suam, denuo dicit, Et erit Unus Grex, & Unus Pastor: Si autem Grex unus est, quomodo potest Gregi annumerari qui in numero Gregis non est? Aut Pastor quomodo haberi potest qui (manente vero pastore, & in Ecclesia Dei Ordinatione succedente) nemini succedens, & a seipso incipiens, Alienus sit & profanus, Dominica pacis ac Divinae Unitatis inimicus; non habitans in domo Dei, i. e. in Ecclesia Dei, in qua non nisi Concordes & Unanimes habitant? Ep. 69. p. 181, 182.

Neither was this Principle peculiar to St. Cyprian: Cornelius, in his so often mentioned Epistle to Fabius, insists on it also, and in a manner Ridicules Novatianus, if not for his Ignorance of it, at least for entertaining the vain Conceit, that it was in his Power to counter-act it^p. And when Maximus, Urbanus, Sidonius, Macarius, &c. deserted Novatianus, and returned to Cornelius his Communion, they made a Solemn Confession, That, upon the score of that same common Maxim, they ought to have look'd upon Novatianus as a False and Schismatical Bishop. We know, say they, that Cornelius was chosen Bishop of the most Holy Catholick Church by the Omnipotent God, and our Lord Jesus Christ. We confess our Error; we were imposed upon; we were circumvented by Persidy and Ensnaring Sophistry — For we are not ignorant, That there is One God; One Christ our Lord, whom we have confessed; One Holy-Ghost; And that there ought to be but One Bishop in a Catholick Church^q. Indeed, two Bishops at once, of one Church or City, were then thought as great an Absurdity as two Fathers of one Child, or two Husbands of one Wife, or two

Ἡ Ἐκκλησία
μία ἐν τοῖς
ἀποστόλοις καὶ
ἐν τοῖς ἐπίσκοποις
ἐστίν· ἡ μία
ἐστὶν ἡ καθολικὴ
ἐκκλησία.
Eus. b. H. E.
Lib. 6. cap. 43.

q Nos Corne-
lium Episco-
pum Sanctissi-
me Catholica

Ecclesia Electum a Deo Omnipotente, & Christo Domino nostro scimus. Nos errorem nostrum confitemur; nos imposturam passi sumus; circumventi sumus perfidia & Loquacitate captiosa: Non enim ignoramus Unum Deum esse; Unum Christum esse Dominum, quem Confessi sumus; Unum Spiritum Sanctum; Unum Episcopum in Catholica Ecclesia esse debere. Ep. 49. p. 93.

Heads.

Heads of one Body, or whatever else you can call *Monstrous* in either Nature or Morality.

2. There was no Canonical *Vacancy*; no Place for a new Bishop, but where the *One Bishop*, whose the Chair had been, was *Dead*, or had *Ceded*, or was Canonically *Deposed* by the rest of the Members of the *Episcopal College*. *Vacancy by Death* hath no Difficulties. I don't remember to have observed any Instances of *Cession* in St. Cyprian's time; (tho' there were some before, and many after;) Unless it was in the Case of *Basiliides*, who, after he had forfeited his Title to that Sacred Dignity by being guilty of the dreadful Crimes of Idolatry and Blasphemy, is said to have *Laid it down*, and to have confessed, That he should be favourably dealt by, if thereafter he should be admitted to the *Communion of Laicks*.^{Ep. 67.} We have Instances of *Deposition* in the same *Basiliides* and *Martialis*,^{Ibid.} in *Marcianus*,^{Ep. 68.} *Privatus Lambestanus*,^{Ep. 36.} *Evaristus*,^{Ep. 50.} *Fortunatianus*,^{Ep. 52.} and perhaps some more. However, these *Three*, I say, were the *only Causes* in which there could be a *Lawful Vacancy*.^{Ep. 65.}

3. When a *See* was thus Canonically *vacant*, it was filled after this manner: The Bishops of the Province, in which the *Vacancy* was, met, choosed and ordained *One* in the presence of the People whom he was to Govern. This St. Cyprian, with other 36 Bishops, tells us, was of *Divina Institution*, and *Apostolical Observation*; And that it was the common Form, not only in *Africa*, but almost in every Province all the World over*. I know, 'tis controverted whether a Bishop, in those Times, was Chosen by the People, or only in the presence of the People? But my present purpose doth not engage me in that Controversie.

Propter quod Traditione Divina & Apostolica Observatione servandum & tenendum est, quod apud nos quoque & fere per Provincias Universas tenetur, ut ad Ordinationes rite celebrandas, ad eam Plebem cui prapostitus ordinatur, Episcopi ejusdem Provincia proximi quique conveniant, & Episcopus deligatur, Plebe presente, &c. Ep. 67. p. 172. Præter illud quod in hac eadem Epistola, De Sabino, Legere est, hujus ritus, tanquam jam cum triti, in Successore, Narcisso Hierosolymitani, Substituendo exemplum luculentum habes apud Euseb. l. 6. c. 10.

4. But Election was not enough: Tho' the Person elected was already a *Presbyter*, and in *Priestly Order*; yet when he was to be Promoted to a *Bishoprick*, he was to receive a new Imposition of Hands, a new Ordination. His former Orders

Orders were not sufficient for that Supreme Office. Thus, e.g. St. Cyrian was first a Presbyter, and then Ordained Bishop of Carthage, if we may believe his Deacon Pontius, Eusebius, and St. Jerome¹. Thus our Holy Martyr tells us, That Cornelius had made his Advances, gradually, through all the inferior Stations, and so, no doubt, had been a Presbyter, before he was a Bishop². And yet we find, when he was Promoted to the See of Rome, he was Ordained by 16 Bishops³. Thus we find also, in the Promotion of Sabinus to the Bishoprick from which Basilides had fallen, that he was Ordained by the Imposition of the Hands of the Bishops who were then present at his Election⁴. Thus Fortunatus, Achiminius, Optatus, Privatianus, Donatulus, and Felix, 6 Bishops, Ordained a Bishop at Capsis⁵. Thus Herachus was first a Presbyter under Demetrius, in the Church of Alexandria, and then succeeded to him in the Episcopal Chair⁶. Dionysius was first a Presbyter under Herachus, and then succeeded to him⁷. And Maximus, who had been a Presbyter under him, succeeded to Dionysius⁸. And before all these, some 70 Years before St. Cyrian's time, Irenæus was first a Presbyter under Photinus, and afterwards his Successor in the Bishoprick of Lyons⁹. Nor is it to be doubted, that each of these was Raised to the Episcopal Dignity by a new Ordination. The first of the Canons, commonly called Apostolical, which requires, That a Bishop be Ordained by two or three Bishops, was, doubtless, all along observed¹⁰. Nay, this Necessity of a new Ordination for Raising One to the Episcopal Power, was so Notorious and Received then, that the Schismaticks themselves believed it indispensable. And therefore Novatianus, tho' formerly a Presbyter, (as Cornelius tells expressly in that so often cited Epistle to Fabius,) when he Rival'd it with Cornelius for the Chair of Rome, that he might have the shew, at least, of a Canonical Ordination, he got three simple inconsiderate Bishops to come to the City, upon pretence of Consulting with other Bishops about settling the Commotions of the Church: And having them once in his Clutches, he shut them up under Lock and Key, till they were put in a scandalous Disorder, and then forced them to give him the Episcopal Mission, by an imaginary and vain Imposition of Hands, as Cornelius words it¹¹. Thus also, when Fortunatus, One of the Five Presbyters who joyned with

¹ Pontius in vita Cypr. Euseb. Chron. Hieron. Catal.

² Per omnia Ecclesiastica Officia promotus — Ad Sacerdotii sublimis fastigium cunctis gradibus ascendit.

Ep. 55. p. 103.

³ Ep. 55. p. 112.

⁴ Ep. 67. p. 172.

⁵ Ep. 56. p. 115.

⁶ Euseb. H. E. lib. 6. c. 19, 20.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Lib. 7. c. 11, 22, 28.

⁹ Euseb. H. E. l. 5. c. 4, 5.

¹⁰ Ἐπισκοπὴ καὶ τῶν ἑπομένων ἀπὸ τῶν τριῶν ἁποστόλων. Canon. Apost. 1.

¹¹ Μετὰ βίας ἠνάγκασεν ἐκκαλεῖν τρεῖς ματαίᾳ καὶ ἐπιδουλοῦν αὐτοὺς ὥστε αὐτὸν ἑπὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐκτελέσειν τὴν λειτουργίαν. Euseb. l. 6. c. 43.

the Schismatical *Feliciſſimus* againſt St. Cyprian, turned bold to ſet up as an Anti-Biſhop at Carthage; He was Ordained by Five falſe Biſhops^k. And now, Sir, by this Account, I think we have our Author's Definition of a Biſhop, in St. Cyprian's time, fairly routed a ſecond time: For,

How could the Maxim of but *One Biſhop*, at once, in a Church hold, if that Biſhop was nothing but a ſingle Preſbyter? The Church of Rome was but *One Church*; ſo was the Church of Carthage: And yet, in each of theſe Churches, there were many ſingle Preſbyters. Again,

If a Biſhop, in St. Cyprian's time, was no more than a ſingle Preſbyter, in the Preſbyterian Senſe, what needed ſo much work about him? Why, e. g. convene all the Preſbyters of a Province, ſuch as Africa or Numidia was, for the Election and Ordination of a ſingle Preſbyter in Carthage, where there were Preſbyters more than enough to have performed all the Buſineſs? What needed the Church of Rome to make ſuch work about ſupplying ſuch a Vacancy as was there, before *Cornelius* was Promoted? Why a Convention of Sixteen Neighbouring Biſhops to give him Holy Orders? Might not the Forty ſix, who lived in Rome, have ſerved the turn? Might not theſe Forty ſix, I ſay, have filled *Fabianus* his Room with far greater Eaſe and Expedition? If they made ſuch work, and had ſuch Difficulties, (as we find they had about a Biſhop,) in ſetting *One ſingle Brother Preſbyter*, when, according to our Author's Principles, they had the full Power of doing it, what had become of them, if *Thirty*, nay *Twenty*, nay *Ten* of the Forty ſix, had all died in one Year? Sure, they had never got ſo many Vacancies filled. And then,

Were not *Cornelius* and *Novatianus* Preſbyters of Rome, before the former was the True, and the latter the Falſe Biſhop of that City? If ſo, what need of a new Election, and a new Ordination for making them Preſbyters of a Church, of which they were Preſbyters already? Had it not been pretty pleaſant, in ſuch a grave, ſerious, persecuted State of the Church, to have ſeen two eminent Men, already Preſbyters of Rome, making ſo much work about being made Preſbyters of Rome? And all the Clergy and Chriſtians of Rome, nay ſooner or later, of all the Chriſtian World, engaged in the Quarrel? What had this been other than the very *Mystery of Ridiculousneſs*? But this is not all.

The

The Premises will as little allow him to have been a *Presbyterian Moderator*: For, to what purpose so much ado about the Establishment of a meer *Moderator* of a *Presbytery*? Why, so much stress laid upon only *one Moderator* in a City? Why no *Canonical Vacancy* of his *Moderatorial Chair*, unless in the case of *Death*, *Cession*, or *Forfeiture*? Sure, if they had then understood all the Exigencies and Analogies of *Parity*, they would not have been so much in love with a *constant Moderator*; no, they would have judged him *highly inconvenient*, and by all means to be *shunned*: If he had been imposed on the Meeting, it had been an *Encroachment* on their *Intrinsic Power*; and so, *absolutely unlawful*, and *Prelacy*: And tho' Chosen by themselves, *fatal*; as having a *violent Tendency* to *Lordly Prelacy*: And therefore they could never have yielded to have *One with a Good Conscience*¹. Again,

¹ *Vide*, True
Representa-
tion of Presb.
Gov. Prop. 15.

How often did the *Presbytery of Rome* meet, in the Interval between *Fabianus* his *Death*, and *Cornelius* his *Promotion*? How many excellent *Epistles* did they write to the Neighbouring *Bishops* and *Churches*, and these, about the most weighty and important Matters during that *Vacancy*? They wrote that which is the *Eighth* in Number, amongst *St. Cyprian's* *Epistles* to the *Carthaginian Clergy*, and, at the same time, *One* to *St. Cyprian*, then in his *Retirement*, which is lost. They wrote that notable *Epistle*, which is the *Thirtieth* in Number, in which they not only mention other of their *Epistles* which they had wrote to *St. Cyprian*, and which are not now extant; but also *Epistles*, one or more, which they had sent to *Sicily*. They wrote also that considerable *Epistle*, which is in Number the *Thirty sixth*. It is not to be doubted that they wrote many more. How many Meetings and Consultations had they, during these *Sixteen Months*, about the Affairs of the Church, and particularly, the Case of the *Lapsi*, which was then so much agitated? Is it probable, that they wanted a *Moderator*; a *Mouth* of their *Meeting*; *One* to keep *Order* in the manner and managing of the Affairs were brought before them all that time, and in all those Meetings? How could they, without one, handle Matters with *Order* and *Decency*? And what was there to hinder them from having *one*, if they had a mind for him? Might they not have chosen *one* as safely as they met? Might they not have chosen

one at every Meeting, according to the Principles of Parity? Farther:

What need of so much Parade about the Election of a Moderator of a Presbytery, as was then about the Election of a Bishop? Why the People chose him, according to the Principles of those, who think that St. Cyprian was for Popular Elections? What was the People's Interest? How was it their Concern, who was Moderator of the Presbytery? What was his Influence, *De jure*, at least, in the Government of the Church, more than the Influence of any other Member of the Presbytery? Nay, is it not confessed, that, as Moderator, he was no Church-Governour at all? That he had no Jurisdiction over his Brethren? That his Power was only Ordinative, not Decisive? To be the Mouth of the Meeting, not to be their Will, or Commanding Faculty? To keep Order in the Manner and Managing of what came before them, not to determine what was Debated amongst them? Why then were the People so much concern'd about him? What Benefits, or what Harm, could redound to them by ones being Moderator of the Presbytery, whatever he was? Besides, as I have shewed before, as Moderator of the Presbytery, he had relation only to the Presbytery: At least, he had none directly, immediately, and formally to the People. What pretence, then, could the People have to Interest themselves in his Election? Nay, say, (as I am apt to think it ought to be said, I am sure the contrary cannot be made appear from St. Cyprian,) that he was not chosen by the People, but only in their Presence; and the same Argument will take place, as is obvious to any body. Farther yet.

What need of Convocating so many from the Neighbourhood for managing the Election of a Moderator, E. g. for the Presbytery of Rome? If a Bishop, in St. Cyprian's time, was nothing but a Presbyterian Moderator, then the Bishops convoked for managing the Election of a Moderator, were Moderators too: And so, by consequence, Sixteen Moderators of other Presbyteries met at Rome to constitute a Moderator for the Roman Presbytery. And might not the Presbytery of Rome have chosen their own Moderator without the Trouble or the Inspection of so many Moderators of other Presbyteries? Once more.

D

What

What Necessity, nay, what Congruity, of a *new Imposition of Hands*, of a *new Ordination*, a *new Mission* for constituting *One a Moderator of a Presbytery*? And this too, to be performed by *none* but *Moderators of other Presbyteries*? Thus, e. g. it behoved *Six Moderators* to meet at *Capsis*, to *Ordain a Moderator for the Presbytery of Capsis*; and *Sixteen at Rome*, to *Ordain a Moderator for the Presbytery of Rome*: And, after he was *Ordained*, it behoved *Novatianus* to be at so much pains to get together *Three Moderators*, to *Ordain himself an Anti-Moderator*. Who can think on these Things without smiling? But perhaps you may think, I have insisted on this Argument more than enough; and therefore I shall leave it, and proceed to other Considerations. To go on, then.

A Bishop, in *St. Cyprian's* time, thus *Elected, Ordained; and Possessed of his Chair*, did bear a *double Relation*; *One to the particular Church* over which he was set, and *another to the Church Catholick*, an integrant part whereof, the particular Church, was, of which he was Bishop. The consideration of each of these *Relations* will furnish us with fresh Arguments against our Author's *Hypothesis*. I shall begin with the *Relation* he bore to his own *particular Church*. And,

FIRST: The first Thing I observe about him, in that regard, shall be, That he was the *Principle of Unity* to *Her*. Whosoever adhered to him, and lived in his Communion, was in the Church a Catholick Christian. Whosoever separated from him, was out of the Church, and a *Schismatick*. He was the *Head* of all the Christians living within his *Diocese*; and they were *One Body, One Society, One Church*, by depending upon him, by being subject to him, by keeping to his Communion. He was the *Sun*, and they were the *Beams*; he was the *Root*, and they were the *Branches*; he was the *Fountain*, and they were the *Streams*; As *St. Cyprian* explains the Matter^a. This is a Point of great Consequence, especially considering that it is the Foundation of the Apologist's Argument, our Author's Answer to which I am examining: and therefore, give me leave to handle it somewhat fully. And I proceed by these Steps.

^a *Unit: Eccl.*
p. 108.

1. There was nothing *St. Cyprian* and the Catholick Bishops, his Contemporaries, valued more, reckoned of higher Importance,

tance, or laid greater Strefs upon, than the *Unity* of the Church: And there was *no Sin* they represented at more Heinous, or more Criminal, than the *Sin of Schism*.

In their reckoning, *Unity* was the great Badge of *Christianity*; God heard the *Prayers* that were put up in *Unity*^b, but ^b *Unit. Eccl.* not those that were performed in *Schism*. Christian Peace, p. 112. Brotherly Concord, and the *Unity* of People in the true Faith and Worship of God, was accounted of greater value by them, than all other imaginable Sacrifices^c. Nothing afforded greater Pleasure to the Angels in Heaven, than Harmony amongst Christians on Earth^d. It were easie to collect a thousand such Testimonies concerning the Excellency of *Unity*. But as for *Schism*, and *Schismatics*, how may it make Men's Hearts to tremble, when they hear what *hard Names*, and what *horrid Notions*, these Primitive Worthies gave them, and had of them? *Schism*, to them, was the Devil's Device for *subverting the Faith*, *corrupting the Truth*, *Cyp. de Orat.* and *cutting Unity*^e. *Christ* instituted the Church, and the *Devil* *Heresie*^f, or *Schism*; for both, then, went commonly ^d *Firmil. Ep.* under one Name. *Schism* was reckoned a greater Crime than *Idolatry* it self: And *St. Cyprian* proves it by several Arguments^g. *Firmilian* affirms it also^h. So doth *Dionysius* ^e *Cyp. Un.* *Alexandria*, in his notable Epistle to *Novatianus*. He tells *Eccl. p. 105.* him, He ought to have suffered the greatest Miseries, rather than divide the Church of God: That *Martyrdom*, for the Preservation of *Unity*, was as Glorious; as *Martyrdom* for not Sacrificing to Idols: Nay, more, Because he who Suffers rather than he will Sacrifice, Suffers only for saving his own Soul; But he that Suffers for *Unity*, Suffers for the whole Churchⁱ. *Schismatics* had not the Spirit^k; Were forsaken of the Spirit^l; Held not the Faith^m. Had neither Father, Son, nor Holy-Ghostⁿ. They were Renegadoes^o; Apostates^p; Malignants^q; Parricides^r; Anti-Christ^s; False Christs^t; Christ's Enemies^u; Blasphemers^v; The Devil's Priests^w; Retainers to Corab^x; Retainers to Judas^y; Villainous and Perfidious^z; Aliens, Profane, Enemies^{aa}; Were without Hope^{bb}.

^m *Un. Eccl. p. 108, 109.* ⁿ *Conc. Carth. Suff. 10.* ^o *Cyp. Ep. 51. p. 95.* ^p *Ep. 55. p. 103.*
^q *Ibid. p. 105.* ^r *Ep. 57. p. 117.* ^s *Conc. Carth. Suff. 1, 11, 64, 87.* ^t *Ep. 69. p. 180.*
^u *Conc. Carth. Suff. 5.* ^v *ib. Suff. 7, & 21.* ^w *Suff. 1, 31.* ^x *Suff. 1.* ^y *Un. Ecc. p. 116.* ^z *Cyp. de Orat. Dom. p. 150.* ^{aa} *Un. Eccl. p. 116.* ^{bb} *Ibid. p. 109.* ^{cc} *Cyp. Ep. 69. p. 182.*

- ^c Un. Eccl. p. 109. Had no Right to the Promises^c; Could not be saved^d; Were Infidels^e; Worse than Heathens^f; Self-Condemned^g; Were more Christians than the Devil^h; Could not belong to Christⁱ; Could not go to Heaven^k; The hottest part of Hell their Portion^l; Their Society, the Synagogue of Satan^m; Their Conventions, Dens of Thievesⁿ; They were Destroyers of Souls^o; Their Preaching was poisonous^p; Their Baptism pestiferous^q, and profane^r; Their Sacrifices abominable^s; They could not be Martyrs^t; Their Company was to be avoided^u: Whoso befriended them, were Persecutors of the Truth^v; Were Betrayers of Christ's Spouse to Adulterers^w; Were Betrayers of Unity^x; Were involved in the same Guilt with them^y. In short, Schismatics, by being such, were, Ipso facto, Persecutors of the Church^z, Enemies of Mercy^a, Infatuated Sals^b, and Cursed of God^c.
- ^k Ibid. ^l Ep. 69. p. 182. ^m Con. Carth. Suff. 60. ⁿ Ep. 73. p. 207. ^o Ep. 72. p. 197. ^p Un. Eccl. p. 111. ^q Con. Carth. Suff. 29. ^r Ep. 43. p. 83. ^s Un. Eccl. p. 112. ^t Ep. 69. p. 180. ^u Un. Eccl. p. 113. ^v P. 114, 117. in Ep. passim. ^w Un. Eccl. p. 115. ^x Ep. 59. p. 140. ^y Con. Carth. Suff. 38. ^z Ibid. Suff. 49, 58, 61. ^a Ep. 73. p. 203. ^b Ep. 69. p. 184. ^c Ep. 43. p. 82, 85. ^d Ep. 60. p. 142. ^e Con. Carth. Suff. 7. ^f Ibid. Suff. 1.

Such, I say, were the Notions the Holy Fathers, in those early Times of the Church, had of Schismatics; and such were the Names they gave them. And certainly who so seriously considers how much *Schism* is condemned in Holy Writ; what an *Enemy* it is to the *Peace*, the *Power*, and the *Propagation* of *Christianity*; and how much it stands in opposition to the *Holy*, *Humble*, *Peaceable*, *Patient*, *Meek*, and *Charitable Spirit* of the *Gospel*: Who so considers, that our Blessed Saviour's great Errand into the World, was to *Unite* all his *Disciples* here into *one Body*, and *one Communion*, that they might *Eternally* be *Blessed* in the full Enjoyment of *one Communion* with the *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy-Ghost*, in *Heaven* hereafter: Who so, I say, considers these Things, cannot but confess, that *Schism* and *Schismatics* deserve all these *hard Names*, and answer all these terrible *Notions*. Now,

2. That, for the Preservation of *Unity*, and the Preventing of *Schism*, in every particular Church, all were bound by the Principles of *St. Cyprian's* Age to live in the *Bishops Communion*; and to own and look upon him as the *Principle of Unity* to that Church of which he was *Head* and *Ruler*, might be made appear from a vast Train of Testimonies.

But

But I shall content myself with a few. Thus, for Example, when some of the *Lapsed* presumed to write to St. Cyprian, and design themselves, without a Bishop, by the Name of a Church; How did the Holy Man resent it? Consider how he begins his Answer to them. Our Lord, (says he) whose Precepts we ought to Honour and Obey, Instituting the Honour of a Bishop, and the Contexture of a Church, saith thus to Peter in the Gospel; I say unto thee, thou art Peter, and upon this Rock will I build my Church, and the Gates of Hell shall not prevail against it: And I will give unto thee the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, &c. From thence by the Vicissitudes of Times and Successions, the Ordination of Bishops, and the Frame of the Church, are transmitted so, as that the Church is built upon the Bishops, and all her Affairs are ordered by them as the chief Rulers: And therefore, seeing this is God's appointment, I cannot but admire the bold Temerity of some, who, writing to me, call themselves a Church; when a Church is only to be found in the Bishop, the Clergy, and the faithful Christians. God forbid, that a number of *Lapsed* should be called a Church, &c. Consider how he Reasons. By Divine Institution, there cannot be a Church without a Bishop: The Church is founded on the Bishop: The Bishop, as Chief Ruler, orders all the Affairs of the Church: Therefore, those *Lapsed* ought not to have called themselves a Church, seeing they had no Bishop, no Principle of Unity. We have another notable Reasoning, as well as Testimony of his, in his 43d Epistle, written to his People of Carthage upon the breaking out of *Feliciſſimus* his Schism. God is One, (says he) and Christ is One, and the Church is One, and the Chair is One, be our Lord's own Voice, founded on St. Peter. Another Altar cannot be reared, another Priesthood cannot be erected, besides the One Altar, and the One Priesthood. Whoso gathereth elsewhere, scattereth. Whatever is done in Human Fury institutes, against God's Appointment, is Adultery. *Domini noster, cujus precepta tenere & observare debemus, Episcopi honorem. & Ecclesie sua Rationem.* *Evangelio, Loquitur & dicit* Petro; Ego dico tibi, quia tu es Petrus, & super istam Petram ædificabo Ecclesiam meam, & portæ inferorum non vincent eam; Et tibi dabo claves regni Cælorum, &c. Inde per temporum & successionum vices, Episcoporum Ordinatio, & Ecclesie ratio decurrit, ut Ecclesia super Episcopos constituatur: Et omnis actus Ecclesie per eosdem præpositos Gubernetur. Cum hoc itaque Divina lege fundamentum sit, miror quosdam audaci temeritate sic mihi scribere voluisse, ut Ecclesie nomine literas facerent: Quando Ecclesia in Episcopo & Clero, & in omnibus sanctis sit constituta: Absit enim, ne Domini misericordia & potestas ejus invidiam patiantur, ut Ecclesia esse dicatur *Lapſorum* numerus. Ep. 33. p. 66.

The Principles of

rous, is Impious, is Sacrilegious. And a little after: O Brethren! Let no Man make you wander from the Ways of the Lord: O Christians! Let no Man rend you from the Gospel of Christ: Let no Man tear the Sons of the Church from the Church: Let them perish alone, who will needs perish: Let them abide alone out of the Church, who have departed from the Church: Let them, alone, not be with the Bishops, who have Rebelled against the Bishops^e, &c.

e Deus unus est, & Christus unus, & una Ecclesia, & Cathedra una super Petrum Domini voce fundata. Aliud Altare constitui, aut Sacerdotium novum fieri, præter unum Altare, & unum Sacerdotium, non potest. Quisquis alibi collegerit, spargit. Adulterum est, impium est, sacrilegum est, quodeunque humano furore instituitur, ut

And, as I observed before, in his Epistle to Florentinus Pupianus, he defines a Church to be a People united to their Priest, and a Flock adhering to their Pastor, &c. and from thence tells Pupianus, That he ought to consider, that the Bishop is in the Church, and the Church in the Bishop: So that if any are not with the Bishop, they are not in the Church^f. And how concernedly doth he Reason the Case in his Book of the Unity of the Church? Can he seem to himself, says he, to be with Christ, who is against Christ's Priests? Who separates himself from the Society of Christ's Clergy and People? That Man bears Arms against the Church: He fights against God's Ordinance: He is an Enemy of the Altar: A Rebel against Christ's Sacrifice. He is Perfidious, and not Faithful; Sacrilegious, and not Religious. He is an Undutiful Servant, an Impious Son, an Hostile Brother, who can contemn God's Bishops, and forsake his Priests, and dares to set up another Altar, and offer up unlawful Prayers^g, &c. Indeed, in that same Book he calls the Bishop, *The Glue that cements Christians into the solid Unity of the Church*^h. And hence it is,

dispositio Divina violetur — Nemo vos, fratres, errare a Domini viis faciat: Nemo vos Christianos ab Evangelio Christi rapiat: Nemo filios Ecclesie de Ecclesia tollat: Percant sibi soli, qui perire voluerunt. Extra Ecclesiam soli remaneant, qui de Ecclesia recesserunt. Soli cum Episcopis non sint, qui contra Episcopos Rebellarunt. Ep. 43. p. 83, 84.

^f Vide supra, pag. 8. vv.

^g An esse sibi cum Christo videtur, qui adversus Sacerdotes Christi facit? Qui se a Cleri ejus & plebis Societate secevit? *Arma ille contra Ecclesiam portat. Contra Dei dispositionem pugnat. Hostis Altaris; adversus Sacrificium Christi Rebellis; pro Fide, Perfidus; pro Religione, Sacrilegus; inobsequens servus; Filius impius; Frater inimicus; contemptis Episcopis & Dei Sacerdotibus dorectis. Constituit audeat aliud Altare, præcem alteram, illicitis vocibus facere, &c.* De Unit. Eccl. p. 116.

^h Deus unus est, & Christus unus, & una Ecclesia ejus, & Fides una, & Plebs in solidam Corporis unitatem, Concordiæ glumino copulata. Ibid. p. 119.

3. That St. Cyprian, every where, makes the Contempt of the One Bishop, or Undutifulness to him, the Origine of Schisms and

and Heresies. Thus, *Epist. 3.* he makes this Observation upon the Undutifulness of a certain Deacon to *Rogatianus*, his Bishop; That such are the first Efforts of Hereticks, and the Out-breaking and Presumptions of ill-advised Schismatics: They follow their own Fancies, and, in the Pride of their Hearts, condemn their Superiours. So Men separate from the Church: So they Erect profane Altars without the Church: So they Rebel against Christian Peace, and Divine Order and Unityⁱ. And, *Ep. 59.* he tells *Cornelius*, That Heresies and Schisms spring from this only Fountain, That God's Priest (the Bishop) is not obeyed; And corum, & Or- Men don't consider, that, at the same time, there ought to be only tus atque Co- One Bishop, only One Judge, as Christ's Vicar, in a Church natus Schisma- And *Ep. 66.* to *Florentius Papianus*, That from hence Heresies tiorum male and Schisms have hitherto sprung, and do daily spring; That the cogitantium, Bishop, who is One, and is set over the Church, is contemned by ut sibi place- the proud Presumption of some: And he that is honoured of God, ant, & Præ- is dishonoured by Men¹. And a little after, he tells him, (allu- tumore con- ding clearly to the Monarchical Power of Bishops) That temnant. Sic Rees have a King; and Beasts have a Captain; and Robbers, ceditur; sic with all humility, obey their Commander: And from thence he Altare profa- concludes, how unreasonable it must be for Christians not to pay suitable num, foris, Regards to their Bishops^m. And in another place, Then is the Bond of collocatur; sic our Lord's Peace broken; then is Brotherly Charity violated; then is contra pacem Christi, & the Truth adulterated, and Unity divided; then Men leap out into He- Ordinationem tem Dei Rebel- refies and Schisms: When? When the Priests are controlled; when atque Unitatem Dei Rebel- the Bishops are envied; when one grudges that himself was not rather latum. *Ep. 3.* preferred; or disdains to bear with a Superiourⁿ. Indeed, p. 6.

^k Neque enim aliunde Hæreses oborta sunt, aut nata sunt Schismata quam inde, quod Sacerdoti Dei non obtemperatur: Nec unus in Ecclesia, ad tempus Sacerdos, & ad tempus Iudex, vice Christi cogitatur. *Ep. 59. p. 129.*

^l Inde enim Schismata & Hæreses Oborta sunt & Oriuntur, dum Episcopus qui unus est, & Ecclesie præst, superba quorundam Presumptione contemnitur; & homo Dignitate Dei honoratur, indignus ab hominibus iudicatur. *Ep. 66. p. 167.*

^m Apes habent Regem, & duces Pecudes, & fidem servant Latrones; Mancipi obsequio pleno humilitatis obtemperant. Quanto simpliciores & meliores vobis sunt brutæ pecudes, & muta animalia, & cruciati licet ac furentes inter Gladios, atque inter arma prædones? Præpositus illis agnoscitur & timetur, quem non Sententia Divina constituit, sed in quem factio perditæ, & nocens Caterva consentit. *Ibid.*

ⁿ Hinc Dominica pacis vinculum rumpitur; hinc Charitatis fraterna violatur; hinc adulteratur veritas; unitas scinditur; ad Hæreses & Schismata Profligitur: Dum obrectatur Sacerdotibus; dum Episcopis invidetur; cum quis aut quaritur non se potius Ordinatum, aut dedignatur alterum ferre præpositum. *De Zelo & Livore, p. 223.*

4. By the Principles of those Times, the Bishop was so much the *Principle of Unity* to the Church which he Governed; the whole Society had such a Dependence on him, was so *Virtually* in him, and represented by him; that what he did, as Bishop, was reputed the *Deed* of the whole Church which he Ruled. If he was Orthodox and Catholic, so was the Body united to him reckoned to be. If Heretical or Schismatical, it went under the same Denomination. If he denied the Faith, whoso adhered to him, after that, were reputed to have denied it. If he confessed the Faith, the whole Church was reckoned to have confessed it in him. Thus,

We find, when *Martialis* and *Basilides*, two Spanish Bishops, committed Idolatry, and so forfeited their Bishopricks, and yet some of their People inclined to continue in their Communion; St. *Cyprian*, with other 36 Bishops, tells those People, That it behoved them not to flatter themselves, by thinking, that they could continue to Communicate with Polluted Bishops, and withal, themselves continue Pure and Unpolluted: For all that communicated with them, would be Partakers of their Guilt: And therefore, (as they go on,) a People obeying and fearing God ought to separate from Criminal Bishops, and be careful not to mix with them in their Sacrilegious Sacrifices*. And again,

* Nec sibi Plebs blandiatur, quasi immunis esse a Contagio delicti possit, cum Sacerdote peccatore Communicans, & ad injustum & illicitum praecepti sui Episcopatum, consensum suum commodans; quando per Osce Prophetam (Hos. 9. 4.) comminetur & dicat Censura Divina — Docens Scilicet. & Ostendens, omnes immo ad peccatum confringi, qui fuerint profani & injusti Sacerdotis Sacrificio contaminati — Propter quod plebs obsequens praeceptis Dominicis, & Deum metuens a peccatore praeposito separare se debet, nec se ad Sacrilegi Sacerdotis sacrificia miscere. Ep. 67. p. 171.

in that same Synodical Epistle, they say, That it was a neglecting of Divine Discipline, and an Unaccountable Rashness to Communicate with *Martialis* and *Basilides*: For whosoever joyned with them in their Unlawful Communion, were Polluted by the Contagion of their Guilt: And whosoever were Partakers with them in the Crime, would not be separated from them in the Punishment^p. Indeed, this is the great Purpose of that 67th Epistle; as also of the 68th concerning *Marcianus*, who, by Communicating with *Novatianus*, had rendred his own Communion Infectious and Abominable^q.

^p Quare et si aliqui de Collegis nostris — Deistam Disciplinam negligendam putant, & cum Basilide & Martiale temere communicant — Tamen, qui malis & peccatoribus — Mista Communionem misceant, nocentium Lethibus polluantur; & dum junguntur in culpa, sic nec in pena separantur. Ibid. p. 175. ^q Ep. 68.

On the other hand, when Cornelius Bishop of Rome confessed the Faith before the Heathen Persecutors, St. Cyprian says, *The whole Roman Church confessed*. And when Cyprian himself, having confessed, received the Sentence of Death; being then at *Utica*, he wrote to his Presbyters, Deacons, and People, at *Carthage*, telling them how earnest he was to Suffer at *Carthage*; Because, as he Reasons, it was most Congruous and Becoming, That a Bishop should confess Christ, in that City, in which he Ruled Christ's Church; That, by Confessing in their Presence, they might be all Ennobled: For whatever, says he, in the moment of Confession, the Confessing Bishop speaks, GOD assisting him, he speaks with the MOUTH OF ALL. And he goes on, telling them, How the Honour of their Glorious Church of *Carthage* should be mutilated, (as he words it.) if he should Suffer at *Utica*; especially, considering how earnest and frequent he had been in his Prayers and Wishes, That he might, both for HIMSELF and THEM, Confess in their Presence at *Carthage*. And upon the same Principle it was, that he so frequently call'd his People, *His Bowels, His Body, The Members of his Body*: And that he affirm'd, That their Grievs were his Grievs; Their Wounds, his Wounds; Their Distresses, his Distresses, &c. Upon the same Principle it was also, that *Pomius* his Deacon, having accounted how our Holy Martyr was executed, in presence of the People, falls out into this Rapture: O blessed People of the Church of *Carthage*, that Suffered together with such a Bishop, with their Eyes and Senses, and, which is more, with open Voice, and was Crowned with him! For tho' all could not Suffer in real Effect, according to their common Wishes, nor really be Partakers of that Glory; yet whoever were sincerely willing to Suffer, in the sight of Christ who was looking on, and in the Hearing of their Bishop, did, in a manner, send an Embassy to Heaven, by One who was a competent Witness of their Wishes.

ORE OMNINIM loquitur, ceterum mutabilitur Honor Ecclesie nostrae tam Gloriosa, si ego Episcopus alterius Ecclesie prepositus, accepta, apud Uticam, super confessione, suavitatem, exinde Martyr ad Dominum proficiscar; quandoquidem Ego & pro ME & pro VOBIS apud VOS confiteri, & ibi pati, & exinde ad Dominum proficisci, Orationibus continuis Deprecari, &c. Ep. 81. p. 238, 239.

Vide Ep. 17. p. 39. & De Lapsis, p. 122, 123. fuse.

O beatum Ecclesie populum, qui Episcopo suo tali, & Oculis pariter & sensibus, & quod amplius est, publicata voce compassus est, & sicut ipso traicante semper audierat, Deo judice

virtus illi
Episcopi prae-
dentis, publico
comprobata est;
adunatio se-
quentis frater-
nitatis Osterfa-
est; dum apud
vos, unus ani-
mus & una
vox est, Eccle-
sia omnis Ro-
mana Confes-
sa est. Ep. 61.

p. 141.

Eo quod con-
gruat Episco-
pum in ea Ci-
uitate in qua
Ecclesie Domi-
nica praest,
illius Dominum
confiteri, &
Plebem uni-
versam, prae-
positi praesentis
Confessione cla-
riscari. Quod
cunque enim
sub illo Confes-
sionis momento,
Confessor Epi-
scopus loquitur,
aspirante Deo,

Coronatus est. Quamvis enim non potuerit evenire, quod optabant vota communia, ut consortio pacis Glorie simul Plures tota pateretur; quicumque sub Christi spectantis Oculis, & sub auribus Sacerdotis ex animo pati voluit, per idoneum voti sui testem, Legationis quodam modo literas ad Deum misit. Pontius in vita Cyp. p. 10.

5. Neither was this of the Bishop's being the Principle of Unity to the Church which he govern'd a Novel Notion, newly Minted in the Cyprianic Age: For, besides that Episcopacy was generally believed, then, to be of Divine Institution; besides, that St. Cyprian still Argues upon the Supposition of a Divine Institution, as particularly, in the same very Case of the Bishops being the Principle of Unity, as may be seen in his Reasoning against the Lapsed, which I have already cited from Ep. 33. and might be more fully made appear, if it were needful. Besides these Things, I say, we have the same thing frequently insisted on by the Holy Ignatius, who was Contemporary with the Apostles, in his Genuine Epistles. Thus, for Instance, in his Epistle to the Church of Smyrna, he tells them, That that is only a firm and solid Communion which is under the Bishop, or allowed by him; and, That the Multitude

Ἐκείνη βε-
βαία ἐνχα-
ρίσιν ἡγούμε-
νον, ἢ ὅτι τὸ Ἐπι-
σκοπὸν ἔσται, ἢ
ὅτι αὐτὸς τὸς
ἐμπροσφύ-
τοι ὡς ἀνθρώπων
ἢ Ἐπίσκοπον
ἐκείνῳ τὸ πᾶν
ἐστὶν ἔσται.
Edit. Lond.
1680. p. 6.

Ὅσοι γὰρ
Θεὸς εἰσιν

ἢ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἐστὶν μετὰ τοῦ ἀποστόλου εἶναι. Καὶ Ὅσοι ἀντιπαύσαντες ἑλθόν-
τες ἐπὶ τῷ ἐρέμῳ τῷ ἐκκλησίας ἐστὶν Θεὸς ἔσονται, ἵνα ὡς καὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ
ᾤοντες. p. 40.

Ὅσοι ὁ μαρισμός ἐστιν καὶ ἑρηνή, Θεὸς ἢ καταιχμία: πάντων ἐν μετανοίᾳ, ἀρεῖν ὁ
κύριος ἐάν μετανοήσωσιν εἰς ἐνότητα Θεὸς καὶ συνίδειαν τοῦ Ἐπισκόπου. p. 43.

mus. And in his Epistle to the *Trallians*, he tells them, that in *Polybius* their Bishop, who came to him at Smyrna, he beheld their whole Society^z.

μαρ Θεὸς ἀπέληξα ἐν Ὁμοίῳ πρὸς ἀγάπῃ ἀδελφότητος, ὑμῶν, ἐν ἐνό-
πῳ. p. 17.

^z — Καθὼς ἐδήλωσεν μοι Πολύβιος ὁ Ἐπίσκοπος ὑμῶν — Ὡς μετὰ τὸ πᾶν πληρῶς
ὑμῶν ἐν αὐτῇ Θεωρίᾳ. p. 47.

6. Indeed, this Principle, of the Bishop's being the Center of Unity to his Church, was most reasonable and accountable in it self. Every particular Church is an *Organiz'd Political Body*; and there can be no Unity in an *Organical Body*, whether *Natural* or *Political*, without a *Principle of Unity*, on which all the Members must hang, and from which, being separated, they must cease to be Members: And who so fit for being this *Principle of Unity* to a Church, as he who was *Pastor, Ruler, Governour, Captain, Head, Judge, Christ's Vicar, &c.* in relation to that Church? This was the True Foundation of that other Maxim which I insisted on before, viz. That there could be but *One Bishop*, at once, in a Church? Why so? Why? Because it was Monstrous for *One Body* to have *Two Heads*, for *One Society* to have *Two Principles of Unity*.

If what I have said does not satisfy you, (tho, in all conscience, it ought, it being scarcely possible to prove any thing of this Nature more demonstratively,) then be pleased only to consider the necessary Connexion that is betwixt this Principle, and that which I am next to prove; and that is,

SECONDLY, That by the Principles of those Times, a Bishop, Canonically Promoted, was *Supreme* in his Church; immediately subject to *Jesus Christ*; independent on any, unaccountable to any Earthly Ecclesiastical Superior. There was no Universal Bishop, then, under *Jesus Christ*, who might be the *Supreme visible Head* of the *Catholick visible Church*. There was, indeed, an *Universal Bishoprick*; but it was not bolden by any *One single Person*. There was an *Unus Episcopatus*; *One Episcopacy*, *One Episcopal Office*, *One Bishoprick*; but it was divided into many Parts; and every Bishop had his

The Principles of

a Episcopatus
unus est, cujus
a singulis in
solidum pars
tenetur. Cyp.
de Un. Eccl.
p. 108.

b Et cum sit
a Christo una
Ecclesia, per
totam Mundum
in multa Mem-
bra divisa;
item, Episco-
pus unus Epi-
scoporum mul-
torum Concordi
numerositate
diffusus, &c.
Ep. 55. p. 112.

c Et quamvis
Apostolis omni-
bus **PAREM**
potestatem tri-
buit & di-
cat, &c. Un.
Eccl. p. 107.

^d Hoc erant
uniqui ceteri
Apostoli quod
fuit Petrus;
PARI CON-
SORTIO.
præditi & ho-
noris & pote-
statis. Ibid.

• Mamente con-
cordia vinculo,
et perseverante
Catholica Ec-
clesia individui
prepositi sui De-

share of it assigned him, to Rule and Govern with the Plenitude of
 the Episcopal Authority^a. There was One Church all the World
 over, divided into many Members; and there was One Episcopacy
 diffused in proportion to that One Church, by the Harmonious Num-
 ber of many Bishops^b. Or, if you would have it in other
 words, the One Catholick Church was divided into many Pre-
 cincts, Districts, or Diocesses; call them as you will: Each of
 those Districts had its singular Bishop; and that Bishop, within
 that District, had the Supreme Power. He was subordinate to
 none but the Great Bishop of Souls, Jesus Christ, the only
 Universal Bishop of the Universal Church. He was indepen-
 dent on, and stood collateral with all other Bishops. There's
 nothing more fully, or more plainly, or more frequently in-
 sisted on by St. Cyprian, than this Great Principle. I shall
 only give you a short view of it from him and his Contem-
 poraries. And,

1. He lays the Foundation of it in the Parity which our Lord instituted amongst his Apostles. Christ, says he, gave Equal Power to all his Apostles when he said, As my Father hath sent me, even so I send you, Receive ye the Holy-Ghost, &c. And again, The rest of the Apostles were the same that St. Peter was, endued with an Equality of Power and Honour^a. Now St. Cyprian, on all occasions, makes Bishops Successors to the Apostles, as perchance I may prove fully hereafter. Thus, I say, he founds the Equality of Bishops, and, by consequence, every Bishop's Supremacy within his own Diocess. And agreeably, he Reasons most frequently. I shall only give you a few Instances.

2. Then, in that excellent Epistle to Antonianus, discoursing concerning the Case of the *Lapsed*, and shewing how, upon former Occasions, different Bishops had taken different Measures about restoring Penitents to the Peace of the Church, he concludes with this General Rule, *That every Bishop, so long as he maintains the Bond of Concord, and preserves Catholick Unity, has Power to order the Affairs of his own Church, as he shall be accountable to God*. Plainly importing, that no Bishop can give Laws to another, or call him to an Account for his Management. To the same purpose is the conclusion

of his Epistle to *Jubaianus*, about the *Baptism* of Hereticks and Schismatics. These Things, most dear Brother, says he, I have written to you, as I was able, neither prescribing to, nor imposing on any Man, seeing every Bishop hath full Power to do as he judges most fitting¹, &c. The same way he concludes his Epistle to *Magnus*, concerning that same Case of *Baptism* performed by Hereticks². To the same purpose is the whole Strain of his Epistle to *Florentius Pupianus*³. And what can be more clear, or full, than his excellent Discourse at the opening of the Council of *Carthage*, Anno 256? More than Eighty Bishops met, to determine concerning that same matter of *Baptism* administered by Hereticks or Schismatics. St. Cyprian was *Præses*, and having briefly represented to them the Occasion of their Meeting, he spoke to them thus: It remains now, that each of us speak his Sense freely, judging no Man, refusing our Communion to no Man, tho' he should dissent from us: For none of us constitutes himself Bishop of Bishops, nor forces his Collegues upon a necessity of Obeying by a Tyrannical Terror; seeing every Bishop is intirely Master of his own Resolutions, and can no more be judged by others, than he can judge others: But we all expect the Judgment of our Lord Jesus Christ, who alone hath Power of making us Governours of his Church, and calling us to an Account for our Administrations⁴.

Hac tibi breviter, pro nostra Mediocritate, rescriptimus, Frater carissime, nemini prescribentes aut præsumimus unusquisque Episcoporum, quod putat, faciat, habens arbitrii sui liberam potestatem. Ep. 73. p. 210.
Ep. 69. p. 188.
Ep. 66.
Supereſt ut de hac ipſa re, ſinguli, quid ſentiamus, proferamus; neminem judicantes, aut à jure Communionis aliquem, ſi diverſum ſenſerit, amoventes. Neque enim quiſquam noſtrum Episcopum ſe Episcoporum conſtituit, aut tyrannico terrore ad obſequendi neceſſitatem Collegas ſuos adigit; quando habeat omnis Episcopopus, pro licentia libertatis & poteſtatis ſuæ, arbitrium proprium; tamque ab alio judicari non poſſit, quam nec ipſe poterit judicare: Sed expeſtemus univerſi judicium Domini noſtri Jeſu Chriſti, qui unus & ſolus habet poteſtatem & præponendi nos in Eccleſiæ ſuæ Gubernatione & de actibus noſtro judicandi. Opp. Cyp. Tom. 1. p. 229.

3. Neither did the Principle hold only in respect of this or the other Bishop; but all without Exception, even the Bishop of *Rome*, stood upon a Level. And for this, we have as pregnant Proof as possibly can be desired: For when the Schismatical Party at *Carthage* set up *Fortunatus* as an *Anti-Bishop*, and thereupon sent some of their Partisans to *Rome* to inform *Cornelius* of their Proceedings, and justify them to him; Cyprian wrote to him also, and thus Reasoned the Case with him. To what Purpose was it for them to go to *Rome* to tell you, that they had set up a false Bishop against the Bishops? Either they

continue in their Wickedness, and are pleased with what they have done; or they are Penitent, and willing to return to the Churches Unity: If the latter, they know whither they may return: For seeing it is determined by us all, and withal, 'tis just and reasonable in itself, That every one's Cause should be examined where the Crime was committed; and seeing there is a Portion of the Flock (the Catholick Church) assigned to every Bishop to be Governed by him, as he shall be accountable to God; our Subjects ought not to run about from Bishop to Bishop, nor break the Harmonious Concord which is amongst Bishops by their subtle and fallacious Temerity: But every Man's Cause ought there to be discussed, where he may have Accusers and Witnesses of his Crime^k, &c. In which Reasoning, we have these Things plain: 1. That, by St. Cyprian's Principles, every Bishop was Judge of his own Subjects; of all the Christians who lived within his District. 2. That no Bishop, nor not the Bishop of Rome, was Superiour to another Bishop; nor could receive Appeals from his Sentences. And, 3. That this Independency of Bishops, this Unaccountableness of one Bishop to another, as to his Superiour, was founded on every Bishop's having his Portion of the Flock assigned to him, to be Ruled and Governed by him, as he should answer to God; i. e. upon his visible Supremacy in his own Church; his being immediately Subordinate to God only. To the same purpose he writes to Stephen Bishop of Rome also: For having told him his Mind freely concerning those who should return from a State of Schism, to the Unity of the Church; how they ought to be Treated, and how Received, &c. he concludes thus: *We know that some are tenacious, and unwilling to alter what they have once determined; and that they will needs retain some Methods peculiar to themselves; but still with the Safety of Peace, and Concord with their Collegues: In which case, we offer Violence, we proscribe Laws to no Man, seeing every Bishop has full liberty in the Administration of the Affairs of his Church, as he will answer to God*^l.

^k *Que autem causa veniendi & Pseudo-Episcopum contra Episcopos factum nuntiandi? Aut enim placeat illis quod fecerunt & in suo scelere perseverant; aut si displicet & recedunt, scient quo revertantur. Nam cum statutum sit omnibus nobis, & equum sit pariter ac justum, ut unusquisque causa illic audiatur, ubi est Crimen admissum, & portio Gregis singulis pastoribus sit ad-*

scripta, quam regat Unusquisque & Gubernet, rationem sui actus Domino redditurus, oportet utique eos quibus presumus, non circumcursare, nec Episcoporum concordiam coherentem sua subdola & fallaci temeritate collidere, sed agere illic causam suam ubi & accusatores habere, & testes sui Criminis possint. Ep. 59. p. 36.

^l *Ceterum scimus quosdam quod semel imbiberint, nolle deponere; nec propositum suum facile mutare; sed salvo, inter Collegas, pacis ac Concordie vinculo, quedam propria, que apud se semel sint usurpata retinere. Qua in re, nec nos vim cuiquam facimus aut legem damus; cum habeat,*

habeat, in Ecclesiæ administratione, voluntatis suæ arbitrium liberum, unusquisque præpositus, rationem sui actus Domino redditurus. Ep. 72. p. 198.

And how do both St. Cyprian and Firmilian resent Stephen's Extravagance, in threatening to refuse his Communion to those who had not the same Sentiments with himself about the Baptism of Hereticks? Let any Man read St. Cyprian's Epistle to Pompeius, and Firmilian's to St. Cyprian^m, and he^m *Vide Ep. 74,* may have enough to this purpose. Would you have yet & 75. more? Then take a most memorable Acknowledgment

from the Presbyters and Deacons of Rome. St. Cyprian had written to them, while the Bishop's Chair was vacant, and given them an account of his Resolutions about the Lapsed; those who had Sacrificed to the Heathen Idols in time of Persecution. Now, consider how they begin their Answer to him. *Alibi*, say they, *a Mind that's without Checks of Conscience, that's supported by the Vigour of Evangelical Discipline, and bears witness to it self, that it has squared its Actions by the Divine Commandments, useth to content it self with God, as its only Judge; and neither seeks other Men's Approbations, nor fears their Accusations; yet they are worthy of doubled Praises, who, while they know their Conscience is subject to God only as its Judge, do yet desire that their Administrations should have their Brethrens Comprobationsⁿ.* So clearly acknowledging St. Cyprian's (and by consequence, every Bishop's) Supremacy within his own District; and his Independency, or Non-Subordination, to any other Bishop; that even Rigaltius himself, in his Annotations on St. Cyprian, tho a Papist, confesses it. And no wonder; For,

in Decretis Cælestibus, testis effectus, soleat, solo Deo iudice, esse contentus; nec alterius aut Laudes petere, aut Accusationes pertimescere; Tamen geminata sicut laude Condigni, qui, cum Conscientiam sciant Deo soli debere se iudici, actus tamen suos desiderant etiam ab ipsis suis fratribus comprobari, &c. Ep. inter Cyprianicas 30. p. 56.

4. By the Principles of those Times, every Bishop was Christ's Vicar within his own District^o; Had a Primacy in his^o — *Judeo* own Church^p; Managed the Ballance of her Government^q; vice Christi Was, by his being Bishop, elevated to the sublime Top of the Priesthood^r; Had the Episcopal Authority in its Vigour^s; the Pre-*Ep. 59. p. 129.* sibi constituere, & primatum assumere, &c. Ep. 69. p. 184. ^q Gubernanda Ecclesiæ Libram tenentes — Ep. 68. p. 177. ^r Sacerdotii sublimæ fastigium. Ep. 55. p. 103. ^s Cum pro Episcopatus vigore, & Cathedra autoritate, haberes potestatem, &c. Ep. 3. p. 5. — Si ita res est, — Altum est de Episcopatus vigore. Ep. 59. p. 126.

* *In Solidum.* *latic Power in its Plenitude*; *A Sublime and Divine Power of*
Un. Eccl. p. 108. *Governing the Church*. And none could be called *Bishop of*
 " — *Actum est* *Bishops*. Every Bishop was *Head* of his own Church"; and
de Ecclesia gu- she was *built* upon him in her *Politick Capacity* *. He, and
bernanda sub- he only, was her *visible Judge*"; and he did not stand *Sub-*
limi ac Divina *ordinate* to any *visible Superiour*. In short, The Constitution
potestate. Cyp. of every particular Church, in those Times, was a *well-*
ad Cornel. *tempered Monarchy*: The Bishop was the *Monarch*, and the *Pres-*
Ep. 59. p. 126. *bytery* was his *Senate*; all the Christians within his District
 v *Neque enim* depended on him for Government and Discipline, and he
quisquam no- depended on no Man: So that I may fairly conclude this
strum Episco- Point with that famous Testimony of St. *Jerom's*, in his
pum se Episco- Epistle to *Evagrius*: *Wherever a Bishop is, whether at Rome or*
porum consti- *Eugubium, Constantinople or Rhegium, Alexandria or Tani,*
tuit. Cyp. in *he is of the same Merit, and the same Priesthood. Neither the*
Conc. Carth. *Power of Riches, nor the Humility of Poverty, maketh a Bishop*
p. 129. Nam *higher or lower; but they are all Successors of the Apostles* *. 'Tis
nec Petrus true indeed, St. *Jerom* lived after the *Cyprianic Age*: But, I
quem primum suppose, our Author will pretend to own his Authority as
Dominus elegit, soon as any Father's in the point of Church-Government.
& super quem Let me represent to you only *one Principle* more, which pre-
edificavit Ec- *Paulus de Cir-* *vailed in the Days of St. Cyprian*: And that is,
clesiam suam, *cum secum*
modum Discip- *modum Disciparet, vindicavit sibi aliquid insolenter, aut arroganter assumpsit, ut diceret se*
Primarum tenere — *Ep. 71. p. 194, 195.*

vv *Vide supra.*

x *Passim.*

y *Vide supra.*

z *Ubique fuerit Episcopus, sive Romæ, sive Eugubii, sive Constantinopoli, sive Rhe-*
gii, sive Alexandriæ, sive Tanis, ejusdem Meriti est, & ejusdem Sacerdotii, potentia divi-
tiarum & Paupertatis humilitas, vel sublimiorem vel inferiorem Episcopum non facit. Cate-
rum omnes Apostolorum Successores sunt. Hieron. ad Evagrium.

THIRDLY, That whatever the *Highb-Priest*, among
 the Jews, was to the other *Priests* and *Levites*, &c. The *Chri-*
stian Bishop was the same to the *Presbyters* and *Deacons*, &c. and
 the same Honour and Obedience was due to him. This was
 a Principle which St. *Cyprian* frequently insisted on, and Rea-
 soned from. Thus in his Third Epistle, directed to *Rogatia-*
mus, he tells him, That he had *Divine Law* and *Warrant* for
 Punishing his *Rebellious* and *Undutiful Deacon*. And then
 cites that Text, *Deut. 17. 12.* And the man that will do pre-
 sumptuously,

sumptuously, and will not hearken unto the Priest, or unto the Judge, even this man shall die: And all the people shall bear and fear, and do no more presumptuously. And confirms it farther, by shewing how God punished Corah, Dathan, and Abiram, for Rebelling against Aaron, Numb. 16. 1. And when the Israelites, weary of Samuel's Government, asked a King to judge them, *The Lord said to Samuel, Harken unto the voice of the People in all that they say unto thee; for they have not rejected thee, but they have rejected me that I should not reign over them: 1 Sam. 8. 7.* Therefore, he gave them Saul for a Punishment, &c. And when St. Paul was challenged for reviling God's High Priest, he excused himself, saying, *He wist not that he was the High Priest: Had he known him to have been so, he would not have Treated him so, for it is written, Thou shalt not speak evil of the Ruler of thy People: Act. 23. 4, 5.* And, (as he goes further on) Our Lord Jesus Christ, Our God, King, and Judge, to the very hour of his Passion paid suitable Honour to the Priests, tho' they neither feared God, nor acknowledged Christ: For when he had cleansed the Leper, he bade him go shew himself to the Priest, and offer his Gift: Matth. 8. 4. And at the very instant of his Passion, when he was beaten, as if he had answered irreverently to the High Priest, he uttered no Reproachful Thing against the Person of the Priest, but rather defended his own Innocence, saying, *If I have spoken Evil, bear witness of the Evil; but if well, why smitest thou me? John 18. 22, 23.* All which Things were done humbly and patiently by him, that we might have a Pattern of Patience and Humility proposed to us; for he taught us to give all dutiful Honour to true Priests, by behaving so towards false Priests^a.

^a Ep. 3. p. 5.

Thus St. Cyprian Reason'd, and these were his Arguments for obliging all Men, Clergy as well as Laity, to Honour and Obey their Bishops. To the same purpose he wrote in his Fourth Epistle to Pomponius, concerning some Virgins and Deacons that lived Scandalously. *Let them not think they can be saved, says he, if they will not obey the Bishops, seeing God says in Deuteronomy, and then he cites Deut. 17. 12^b.* He insists on the same Arguments in his 59th Epistle directed to Cornelius, when he is giving him an account of the Rebellion, and Schismatical Practices of Fortunatus and Felicissimus, the one a Presbyter, and the other a Deacon^c. He insists on them

^b Ep. 4. p. 9.

^c Ep. 59. p. 128.

^d Ep. 66. p. 166. over again, in his 66th Epistle to *Florentius Papiamus*^a. He insists largely on the Argument drawn from the Punishment inflicted on *Corah* and his Complices for Rebelling against *Aaron*; and makes it the same very Sin in Schismaticks, who separate from their lawful Bishop, in his 69th Epistle directed to *Magnus*^e; and in his 73d Epistle, directed to *Jubaianus*^f.
^e Ep. 69. p. 183. And *Firmilian* also, St. Cyprian's Contemporary, insists on the same Argument^g. Indeed, the Names, *Priest*, *Priesthood*, *Altar*, *Sacrifice*, &c. so much used in those Times, are a pregnant Argument of the Notions Christians had then, of the *Christian Hierarchy's* being Copied from the *Jewish*. Neither was it a Notion newly started up in St. Cyprian's time, for we find it in express Terms in that notable Epistle written to the *Corinthians* by St. *Clement* Bishop of *Rome*, who was not only Contemporary with the Apostles, but is by Name mentioned by St. *Paul*, as one of his Fellow-Labourers, whose Names are in the Book of Life, Philip. 4. 3. For he persuading those *Corinthians* to lay aside all Animosities and Schismatical Dispositions, and to pursue and maintain Unity and Peace, above all things; proposes to them as a proper Expedient for this, that every Man should keep his Order and Station; and then enumerates the several Subordinations under the *Old Testament*, which sufficiently proves, That the Hierarchy was still preserved in the *New*. His Method of Reasoning, and the Design he had in hand to compose the Schisms that arose amongst the *Corinthians*, make this evident beyond all Contradiction, That a Bishop in the *Christian Church* was no less than the High Priest among the *Jews*, else he had not argued from the *Precedents* of the Temple to persuade them to Unity in the Church. The High Priest (saith he) has his proper Office, and the Priests have their proper Place or Station; and the Levites are tied to their proper Ministries; and the Layman is bound to his Laick Performances^h.

^h τῶ ἀρχιερεὶ
 ἰδὲαι λειτურ-

γίας δεδωμένα εἶναι, καὶ τοῖς ἱερεῦσιν ἰδίᾳ ὁ τόπος προσετακταί, καὶ λευίταις ἰδὲαι διακονίας ἐπικεινται: ὁ λαϊκὸς ἀνδρῶν τοῖς λαϊκοῖς προστάγμασι δεδωται. Clem. Epist. ad Cor. p. miki, 53.

Having thus demonstrated, that these were three current and received Principles in St. Cyprian's time, viz. That a Bishop was the Principle of Unity to his Church, to all the Chri-

Christians within his *District*; That he was *Supreme* in his *Church*, and had no *Earthly Ecclesiastical Superiour*; and, That he was the *same* amongst *Christians*, which the *High Priest* was amongst the *Jews*: Let me try a little, if our *Author's* Definition of a *Bishop*, in *St. Cyprian's* time, can consist with them. I am afraid, it can consist with none of them singly, much less with all three together.

I. Not with the first; for, if a *Bishop*, then, was the *Principle of Unity* to a *Church*, in which there were many *Presbyters*; as *Cyprian*, e. g. was to the *Church of Carthage*, and *Cornelius* to the *Church of Rome*, and *Fabius* to the *Church of Antioch*, and *Dionysius* to the *Church of Alexandria*, &c. If thus it was, I say, then, to be sure, a *Bishop* was another thing than a meer *single Presbyter* of a *single Parish* in the *Presbyterian* sense: For, if a *single Presbyter* could have been the *Principle of Unity* to a *Church* in which there were, e. g. 46 *single Presbyters*, he must have been it as a *single Presbyter*, or as something else: Not as a *single Presbyter*, for then there should have been as many *Principles of Unity* in a *Church*, as there were *single Presbyters*; for Instance, There should have been 46 *Principles of Unity* in the *Church of Rome*: Which, besides that 'tis plainly *Contradictory* to the *Notion of One Bishop*, at once, in a *Church*; what is it else, than to make a *Church* such a *Monster* as may have 46 *Heads*? Than by so multiplying the *Principles of Unity*, to leave no *Unity* at all? Than, in stead of *One Principle of Unity* to an *Organized Body*, to set up 46 *Principles of Division*? Indeed, what is it else than the very *Extract of Nonsense*, and *Cream of Contradiction*? A *single Presbyter* then, if he could have been the *Principle of Unity* to such a *Church*, must have been it, as something else than a meer *single Presbyter*. But what could that *Something else* have been? A *Presbyterian Moderator*? Not so neither; for by what *Propriety of Speech* can a *Moderator* of a *Presbytery*, as such, be called the *Principle of Unity* to a *Church*? How can he be called the *Principle of Unity* to a *Church*, who, as such, is neither *Pastor*, *Head*, nor *Governour* of a *Church*? Who, as such, has no direct, immediate, or formal *Relation* to a *Church*? Who, as such, is only the *Chair-man*, the *Master-Speaker*, not of the *Church*, but of the *Presbytery*? Nay, who may be such, and yet no *Christian*? For however *inexpedient*

dient or indecent it may be, that an *Heaven* should, on occasion, be the *Moderator*, i. e. the Master-Speaker of a *Presbytery*; yet it implies no Repugnancy to any Principle of Christianity. But however this is, 'tis certain, that, according to the Presbyterian Principles, (not the *Moderator*, but) the *Presbytery* is the Principle of *Unity* to the Church, or rather Churches, within the Bounds of that *Presbytery*. And, to do our Author Justice, he seems to have been sensible of this, as I observed already: And therefore, he said not, *If he* (the Apologist) can prove, that we separate from our Pastors, or from the *Moderator* of the *Presbytery*; but, from our Pastors, or from the *Presbytery* with their *Moderator*. Neither,

2. Can our Author's Definition consist with the second Principle, viz. That every Bishop was *Supreme* in his Church, *Independent*, and not *Subordinate*, to any Ecclesiastical Superior on Earth. To have such a Supremacy, such an *Independency*, such an *Unaccountableness*, is notoriously inconsistent with the Idea of either a *single Presbyter*, or a *Presbyterian Moderator*. How can it be consistent with the Idea of a *single Presbyter* acting in *Parity* with his Brethren Presbyters, that of 46, for Example, One should have a *Primacy*, a *Supremacy*, a *Plenitude of Power*, the *Sublime* and *Divine Power* of *Governing the Church*, an *Unaccountable* and *Eminent Power*, as St. Jerome himself calls it¹. And all the rest should be *Accountable*, and *Subordinate* to him? What is this but reconciling Contradictions? Besides, the *Independency* of *single Presbyters* is notoriously inconsistent with the *Presbyterian Scheme*. 'Tis *Independency*, not *Presbytery*. And as for the *Presbyterian Moderator*, In what sense can he be called *Supreme*, or *Independent*, or *Unaccountable*? In what sense can he be said to be raised to the *Sublime Top of the Priesthood*? Or to have an *Exors Potestas*, an *Unaccountable Power*? Or to be *Accountable* to God only? Or to have the *Sublime* and *Divine Power* of *Governing the Church*? Is he, as such, raised to the *Sublime Top of the Priesthood*, who, as such, may be no *Priest* at all? For why may not a *Ruling Elder* be a *Moderator*? How can he be said to have an *Unaccountable Power*, who can be Voted out of his Chair with the same Breath with which he was Voted into it? How can he be said to be *Accountable* to God only, who is *Accountable* to the *Presbytery*? How can he be said to have the *Sublime* and

¹ Exors quodam & ab omnibus eminens potestas.

and Divine Power of Governing the Church, who, as such, is no Church Governour? Has he a Supreme Power in a Society, who, as such, has no imaginable Jurisdiction over any one Member of that Society?

3. But what shall I say to the Consistency of our Author's Definition with the third Principle I named? Even no more than that I have proved it to have been one of St. Cyprian's, and one that was generally received in his time; and that I can refer it to our Author himself to Determine, Whether the High Priest of the Jews bore no higher Character than that of a single Presbyter, or a Presbyterian Moderator? And so I proceed to another Head of Arguments, which shall be,

FOURTHLY, To give you, in a more particular Detail, some of the Branches of the Episcopal Prerogative in St. Cyprian's time. And I think I shall do enough for my purpose, if I shall prove these three Things:

I. That there were several considerable Acts of Power relating to the Government and Discipline of the Church, which belonged solely to the Bishop's several Powers lodged in his Person, which he could manage by himself, and without the Concurrence of any other Church-Governour.

II. That in every Thing relating to the Government and Discipline of the Church, he had a Negative over all the other Church-Governours within his District. And,

III. That all the other Clergy-men within his District, Presbyters as well as others, were subject to his Authority, and obnoxious to his Discipline and Jurisdiction.

I. I say, there were several considerable Acts of Power relating to the Government and Discipline of the Church, which belonged solely to the Bishop; several Powers lodged in his Person, which he could manage by himself, and without the Concurrence of any other Church-Governour. Take these for a Sample. And,

First,

First, He had the sole Power of Confirmation; of imposing Hands on Christians, for the Reception of the Holy-Ghost, after Baptism. For this, we have St. Cyprian's most express Testimony in his Epistle to *Jubaianus*, where he tells, It was the Custom to offer such as were Baptized to the Bishops, that, by their Prayers, and the laying on of their Hands, they might receive the Holy-Ghost, and be Consummated by the Sign of our Lord, i. e. by the Sign of the Cross, as I take it: And he expressly founds this Practice on the Patern of St. Peter and St. John, mentiond *Acts* 8. 14. &c.^k Firmilian is as express in his Epistle to Cyprian, laying in plain Language, That the Bishops, who Govern the Church, possess the Power of Baptism, Confirmation, and Ordination^l. 'Tis true, he calls them *Majores Natu*, Elders: But that he meant Bishops, as distinguished from Presbyters, cannot be called into Question by any Man, who reads the whole Epistle, and considers his Stile all along; and withal, considers what a peculiar Interest, by the Principles of these Times, the Bishop had in these three Acts^m names. But whatever groundless Altercations there may be about his Testimony, as there can be none about St. Cyprian's, so neither can there be any shadow of Pretext for any about Cornelius's, who, in his Epistle to *Fabius*, (so often mentioned before,) makes it an Argument of Novatianus his Incapacity of being a Bishop; that thò he was Baptized, yet he was not Confirmed by the Bishop^m.

^k — Et ita
circo quia legi-
timum & Ec-
clesiasticum
Baptisma con-
secuti fuerant
(quos Philip-
pus tinxerat)
Baptizari eos
ultra non oport-
tebat; sed tan-
tummodo quod
deceat id a Pe-
tro & Joanne
factum est; ut
Oratione pro iis
habita, & ma-
nu imposita, in-
vocaretur &

insundaretur super eos Spiritus Sanctus: Quod nunc quoque apud nos Geritur, ut qui in Ecclesia Baptizantur, Præpositis Ecclesiæ offerantur, & per nostram Orationem ac manus impositionem, Spiritum Sanctum consequantur, & signaculo Dominico Consecrantur. Ep. 73. p. 202.

^l Omnis potestas & Gratia in Ecclesia est, ubi Præsident Majores Natu, qui & Baptizandi & Manum imponendi & Ordinandi possident potestatem. Ep. 75. p. 221.

^m Ὅτι μὴ ἐδὲ τῶν λοιπῶν ἐπὶ τοῦ χρίσματος μεταλαμβάνειν μετὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας καὶ ὄντα, ὅτι τὸ σφραγισθῆναι καὶ τὸ Ἐπισκοπεῖν, &c. Apud Euseb. H. E. lib. 6. cap. 43.

Secondly, He had the sole Power of Ordination, and that of whatsoever Clergy-men within his District. Ordinations could not be performed without him; but he could perform them Regularly, without the Concurrence of any other Church-Officer. This has been so frequently and so fully proved by Learned Men, that I need not insist much on it. Forbear- ing therefore to adduce the Testimonies of such as lived after

St Cy-

St. Cyprian's time, such as *Ambrose, Jerom, Chrysostom, &c.* I shall confine my self to St. Cyprian, and his Contemporaries. To begin with St. Cyprian.

'Tis true, so humble and condescending he was, That when he was made Bishop, he resolved with himself to do nothing by himself, concerning the Publick Affairs of the Church, without consulting not only his Clergy, but his Peopleⁿ. I call this his own free and voluntary Condescension: It was a thing he was not bound to do by any Divine Prescript, or any Apostolical Tradition, or any Ecclesiastical Constitution. His very Words import so much, which you may see on the Margin. And yet, for all that, we find him not only in extraordinary Junctures, Ordaining without asking the Consent of his Clergy or People; but still insisting on it as the Right of all Bishops, and particularly his own, to Promote and Ordain Clergy-men, of whatsoever Rank, by himself, and without any Concurrence. Thus,

In his 38th Epistle, having Ordained *Aurelius* a Lector, he acquaints his Presbyters and Deacons with it, from the Place of his Retirement: Now consider how he begins his Letter. In all Clerical Ordinations, most dear Brethren, says he, I used to Consult you beforehand, and to examine the Manners and Merits of every one with common Advice°. And then he proceeds to tell them, How, that notwithstanding that was his ordinary Method, a Rule he had observed for the most part; yet, for good Reasons he had not observed it in that Instance. In which Testimony, we have these Things evident: 1. That his Power was the same, as to all Ordinations, whether of Presbyters or others: For he speaks of them all indefinitely; In Clericis Ordinationibus. 2. That he used only to ask the Counsel and Advice of his Clergy, about the Manners and Merits of the Person he was to Ordain, but not their Concurrence in the Act of Ordination; not one word of that: On the contrary, That they used not to Concurr, fairly imported in the very Instance of *Aurelius*. 3. That it was intirely of his own Easiness and Condescension, that he Consulted them in the Matter: He USED to do it, but needed not have done it: He did it not in that very same Case. Which is a demonstration of the Truth of what I said before, viz. That his Resolution, which he had made when he entred to his Bishop-

Solus rescribere nihil potui, quando a primordio Episcopatus mei, STATUERIM nihil sine consilio vestro, & sine consensu plebis, mea privatim sententia gerere.
Ep. 14. p. 33.

In Ordinationibus Clericis SOLEMUS vos ante consulere, & mores ac merita singulorum Communi Consilio ponderare.
Ep. 38 p. 74.

Bishopricks, was from his own Choice, and absolutely Free and Voluntary.

We have another remarkable Testimony to the same purpose in his 41st Epistle, where he tells, that, Because of his Absence from Carthage, he had given a Deputation to Galdinus and Herculanus, two Bishops; and to Rogatianus and Numidicus, two of his Presbyters, to examine the Ages, Qualifications, and Merits, of some in Carthage, that he, whose Province it was to promote Men to Ecclesiastical Offices, might be well informed about them, and Promote none but such as were Meek, Humble, and Worthy^p. This, I say, is a most remarkable Testimony for our present Purpose; for he not only speaks indefinitely of all Ranks or Orders, without making Exceptions; but he speaks of himself in the Singular Number, as having the Power of Promoting them; and he founds that Power, and appropriates it to himself, upon his having the Care of the Church and her Government committed to him.

^p — Cum-
que ego vos pro
me Vicarios
misirim, — Ut
etates eorum,
& Conditiones,
& Merita dis-
cerneretis; ut
jam EGO

CUI CURA INCUMBIT, omnes optime nossem, & dignos atque humiles & mi-
res, ad Ecclesiastica Administrationis officia promoverem, Ep. 41. p. 79.

We have a third Testimony as pregnant as any of the former, in his 72d Epistle written to Stephen Bishop of Rome. For, representing to him what the Resolution of the African Bishops were concerning such Presbyters and Deacons as should return from a State of Schism, to the Communion of the Church, he discourses thus. By common Consent and Authority, Dear Brother, we tell you further, That if any Presbyters or Deacons, who have either been Ordained before in the Catholick Church, and have afterwards turned Perfidious and Rebellious against the Church; or, have been Promoted by a Profane Ordination, in a State of Schism, by FALSE BISHOPS and Anti-Christes, against our Lord's Institution — that such, if they shall return, shall only be admitted to Lay-Communion, &c.^q By which Testimony, you may clearly see, 1. That all Ordinations of Presbyters, as well as Deacons, were performed by Bishops; by

^q Addimus
plane & con-
jungimus, fra-
ter carissime,

consensu & Auctoritate communi, ut etiam si qui Presbyteri aut Diaconi, qui vel in Ecclesia Catholica prius Ordinati fuerint, & postmodum perfidi & Rebellis contra Ecclesiam fuerint; vel apud Hereticos a PSEUDO-EPISCOPIS & Anti-Christis contra Christi dispositionem, profana Ordinatione promoti sint, & contra Altare unum atque Divinum, Sacrificia foris falsa ac Simulacra offerre conati sint; eos quoque hinc Conditione suscipi, cum revertantur, ut Communicant Laici, &c. Ep. 72. p. 197.

True Bishops in the Catholic Church; and by False Bishops in a State of Schism. 2. That to Ordain Presbyters and Deacons, was so much, and so acknowledged by, the Bishop's Work, and peculiar to him, that, herein, even *Schismatics* themselves observed the *Common Rule*. They found their *Ordinations* were indispensibly to be performed by *Bishops*, that they might not be *Obnoxious* to the Charge of *Invalidity*.

So clear and full is *St. Cyprian* on this Head: And not only he, but *Firmilian*, as I have cited him already. Nay, further yet,

Our Martyr's Practice was always suitable and correspondent to these Principles. He not only Ordained *Aurelius* a *Lector*, as I have shewed, without either the Consent or Concurrence of his Clergy; but also *Saturus* a *Lector*, and *Optatus* a *Sub-Deacon*, *Epist.* 29. and *Calerinus* a *Lector*, *Ep.* 39. In which we have also a most considerable Evidence of the Bishops Power in Ordinations, in *St. Cyprian's* Discourse concerning *Aurelius* and *Calerinus*: For there he tells his Presbyters, Deacons, and all his People, and tell them in an Authoritative Style, in the Style, by which Superiours used to signify their Will and Pleasure to their Subjects, with a *Be it known to you*; He tells them, I say, That tho he had only Ordained these two, *Lectors*, for the time, because they were but young; yet he had designed them for the *Presbyterate*, and to sit with him, as soon as their Years would allow of it.

¹ *Caterum Presbyterii ho-*

norm designasse nos illis jam SCLATIS — Sessuris nobiscum, propositis & corroboratis annis suis. Ep. 39. p. 78.

And what can be more pat to this purpose, than that uncontrollable Account we have of *Novatianus* his Promotion to the *Presbyterate*, which we have in that so often mentioned Epistle written by *Cornelius* to *Fabius* of *Antioch*? There he tells, how *Novatianus* was Ordained a *Presbyter*, meerly by the Favour of the then Bishop of *Rome*. That all the Clergy, and many of the People, opposed it, as being Unlawful, considering that he had been Baptized while on the Bed of Sickness: And that, after much work, the Bishop prevailed, and Ordained him, promising that he would not make a Precedent of it. I refer you to the Testimony which I have transcribed faithfully on the Margin. Consider it, and tell me if any thing

thing can be more clear, than that the Bishop, *then*, had the
 sole Power of Ordination'.
 * Κατ' ἐξίωθιν τῆ Πρεσβυτε-
 ρείᾳ καὶ χάριν τῶ Ἐπισκόπου τῷ ἐπιθνήσκει αὐτῷ χεῖρας ἐκ Πρεσβυτερίου καλῶν. *Ὅς
 διακονοῦμεν ὁ ἵνα πάντες τῷ κλήρῳ, ἀλλὰ καὶ λαϊκῶν πολλῶν. Ἐπει μὴ ἔξον ἦν ἢ
 ὅτι λείπης διὰ νόσον ἀπεχθάντα, ὡς καὶ ἔτ' ἐστίν, εἰς κλήρον προήγαγε καὶ ἡξίωσεν
 ἀποχρηθῆναι αὐτῷ τὸ πᾶν μόνον χειροτονίᾳ. Euseb. Hist. Eccl. l. 6. c. 43.

Neither do we read in all St. Cyprian's Works, or in any
 Monuments of those Times, of any Concurrence of Presby-
 ters with Bishops, in any Ordinations, and far less, that ever
 Presbyters Ordain'd without a Bishop. 'Tis true, we read in
 St. Cyprian's 52d Epistle, that Novatus made Felicissimus a Dea-
 con: And I read, that several Learned Men understand it so,
 as if he had Ordained him'. And Blondel particularly, be-
 cause Novatus was nothing but a Presbyter, concludes, that
 this was a notable Instance of the Power of Presbyters in Ordi-
 nations. But when one reads the whole Passage, as St. Cy-
 prian hath it, and ponders all Things duly, he cannot but
 think it strange, that ever that Fancy should have been enter-
 tained: For all that St. Cyprian says, amounts to no more
 than this, That Novatus turn'd a Schismatick in the time of
 Persecution, and thereby became another Persecution to the
 Church; and that having thus given himself up to the Spirit
 of Schism, he, by his Faction and Ambition, got Felicissimus
 made a Deacon, without either St. Cyprian's Knowledge or At-
 lowance". St. Cyprian's Words, I say, do not import, that
 Novatus Ordain'd Felicissimus: They import no more, than
 that Novatus his Ambition and Faction prevailed to get Felicis-
 simus Ordain'd a Deacon, tho' himself did not Ordain him. ('Tis
 probable he was Ordained by some Neighbouring Bishop, St. Cy-
 prian being then in his Secession.) And 'tis as evident as any
 thing can be made, from what immediately follows, that
 St. Cyprian designed them for no more. For he goes on, and
 tells, in that same Breath, That Novatus having done so and so
 at Carthage, went next to Rome, and attempted just the like
 things there; only with this difference, That as Rome, by its
 Greatness, had the Precedency of Carthage, so he attempted greater
 Wickedness at Rome than at Carthage: For he (says Cyprian)
 permittebat me, nec sciente, sua factione & ambitione constituit. Ep. 52. p. 27.

* Idem est No-
 vatus qui quos-
 dam istic ex
 fratribus ab
 Episcopo Segre-
 gavit, qui in
 ipsa persecutio-
 ne ad everten-
 das fratrum
 mentes, alia
 quedam perse-
 cutio nostris
 fuit. Ipse est
 qui Felicissi-
 mum satelliti-
 um suum, Dia-

who had made a Deacon at Carthage against the Church, made a Bishop at Rome, meaning *Novatianus*. Now 'tis certain that not *Novatus*, but *Three Bishops*, Ordained *Novatianus*; and, by consequence, that St. Cyprian never meant that *Novatus* Ordain'd *Felicissimus*. This is irrefragable. But then, suppose the worst; Suppose *Novatus* had really Ordained *Felicissimus*, what stress is to be laid on the Example of a Schismatic? Especially when what he did was done Schismatically? *via molitus est, Anicimus* asked of St. Cyprian, what was *Novatianus* his Heresie? And Cyprian answered, *It was no matter what he taught, seeing he taught in Schism*. And may we not say with the same Reason, That it matters not what *Novatus* did, seeing what he did was done in Schism? One Thing indeed we learn from this Matter, and that is another Argument of the Bishop's peculiar Interest in the matter of Ordination; For St. Cyprian most plainly imputes it to Schism, that, without his Allowance, *Novatus* should have presumed to have got *Felicissimus* Ordained a Deacon.

Roma præcedere, illis majora & graviora commisit: Qui istic adversus Ecclesiam, Diaconum fecerat, illis Episcopum fecit, &c. Ep. 52. p. 97.

Quod vero ad Novatiani personam pertinet: F. C. de quo desiderasti tibi scribi, quam heresim introduxisset; scias nos primo in loco, nec curiosos esse debere quid ille doceat, cum foris doceat. Ep. 55. p. 112.

One Word more: The Bishops being thus possessed of the sole Power of Ordination in St. Cyprian's time, and his Practising suitably, was exactly agreeable to the Second of the Canons commonly called of the Apostles; which is, Let a Presbyter be Ordained by One Bishop, as likewise a Deacon and the rest of the Clergy. A Canon, without doubt, universally received then, as *Beveregius* has fully proved; and a Canon highly agreeable with the then current Principles, which I have insisted on already, viz. That a Bishop was the Principle of Unity, and Supreme Ecclesiastical Magistrate within his District. For what can be more suitable to, or rather, more necessary by all the Fundamental Rules of Society, than that it should belong to the Supreme Power, wherever it is lodged, to promote and give Commissions to all Inferiour Officers? 'Tis one of the Rights of Majesty, and one as intrinsic and unalienable, or incommunicable, as any. 'Tis true, a good many Years after

ter St. Cyprian's time, it was appointed by the *Canon*, That *Presbyters* should *concurr* with the *Bishop* in the *Ordination* of *Presbyters*: But then, I say, it was many Years after St. Cyprian's time; and it was for new emergent Reasons; That *Ordinations* might be performed more deliberately, or with the greater Solemnity, or so; but 'tis evident, that nothing of the substantial *Validity* of the *Orders* were to depend upon it. And so much, at present, for the *Bishop's Power* of *Ordination*. But this is not all. For,

Thirdly, He had full Power, without asking the Consent or Concurrence of either Clergy or People, to settle *Presbyters* within his *District*. Of this, we have a most remarkable Instance of St. Cyprian's planting *Numidicus* a *Presbyter* of the City of *Carthage*: Our Martyr wrote to his *Presbyters*, *Deacons*, and *People*, to receive him as such, (probably he had been *Ordained* before,) and there was no more of it: It was instantly done*. As we learn from the very next *Epistle*†, where we find the same *Numidicus*, as a *Presbyter* of *Carthage*, receiving a *Commission* for a *Deputation* to oversee such and such Things in St. Cyprian's absence. So negligent, shall I say? Or so ignorant was St. Cyprian of *Christ's Testament*, at least of his Leaving, in it, to his People, by way of *Legacy*, a *Right*, a *Grant*, a *Privilege*, of *Choosing* their own *Ministers*? What a Stranger has he been to all the Analogies and Principles of *Presbyterian Government*! But I proceed.

* Ep. 40.

† Ep. 41, & 43.

Fourthly, In St. Cyprian's time, the *Bishop* had the disposal of all the *Revenues* of the *Church*. All the *Churches Incomes*, then, were *Oblations*, and *Charitable Contributions*. The *Civil Magistrate* was *Heathen*, and treated her commonly with *Persecutions*, never with *Encouragements*. Now, the *Bishop*, I say, had the full Power of disposing of these *Contributions* and *Oblations*.

In the first place, he had his own *Quantitas Propria*, His proper Portion; and twas, no doubt, a considerable One. 'Tis commonly reckoned to have been the *Third*. The other *Two* belonged to the *Clergy* and the *Poor*; but so, as to be dispensed by the *Bishop*.

That

That he had his own Portion, and that a Liberal One, is evident from his 7th Epistle; For there he tells how, before he retired, he gave the Trust of it to Rogatianus, one of his Presbyters, ordering that if there were any necessitous Strangers at Carthage, they should have Maintenance out of it ^a. And it is observable, that when St. Cyprian gives an account of Fortunatianus, who had been Bishop of Assura, but had forfeited by Sacrificing in time of Persecution, and yet was earnest for all that to retain his Bishoprick; he says expressly, that it was upon the account of the Perquisites, and not from any Love to Religion^b. And it is not to be doubted, that the same Reason moved Basilides to be so much concerned for the recovery of his Bishoprick, after he had forfeited it also^c. Indeed, the Bishop's proper Portion was settled on him by the 40th of the Apostolic Canons.

laciones & Luca desiderant, quibus prius insatiabiles incubabant, & canis atque epulis etiam nunc inhiant, quarum crapulam nuper superfluo indicis Cruditate rullabant; nunc manifestissime comprobantes, nec ante se Religioni, sed ventri potius, & questui, profana Cupiditate servisse. Ep. 65. p. 163. ^c Vide Ep. 67. p. 173.

And that he had the disposal of the rest, particularly that which belonged to the Clergy, is as plain. For, in his 41st Epistle, he makes it an aggravation of Felicissimus's Guilt, that, contrary to the Duty which he owed to his Bishop, he should have made such a Clutter, about the Division of the Contributions. And on the other hand he praises the Dutifulness of others, who would not follow Felicissimus his bad Example, but continued in the Unity of the Church, and were satisfied to take their Shares, as the Bishop should please to dispense them^a. And it is a most remarkable Instance of this his Power, which we have in the aforementioned Case of Aurelius and Celerinus; Loci mei honore motus — In quo quidem gratulor plurimis Fratres ab hac audacia recessisse, & nobis acquiescere maluisse, ut cum Ecclesia matre remaneret, & stipendia ejus, EPISCOPO DISPENSANTE perciperent. Ep. 41. p. 80.

^c Ceterum Presbyterii honorem designasse nos illis jam sciatis ut & sportulis iisdem cum Presbyteris honorantur, & divisiones mensurnas equatis quantitatibus participantur. Ep. 38. p. 78.

ἡ Πάτρις τῆς Ἀποστολικῆς Κανὼν. And we find *Bishops* in Possession of it long before St. *Cyprian's* time; as is evident from *Justin Martyr's* second Apology, not far from the end. Not now to mention that it seems fairly to be founded on express Scripture. Indeed,

ἐκ τῶν ἀποστολικῶν, &c. C. Ap. 38.

ἢ Vide Clariff. Dodwel. Dissert. Cyp. 1. Sect. 9.

Fifthly, He seems to have had a Power of imposing Charitable Contributions on all the Christians within his District, for the Relief of Distressed Strangers, whether Captives, Prisoners, or condemn'd to the Mines or Gallies, &c. Of this Power, we have famous Instances in his 62d and 78th Epistles. You may Consult them at your Leasure. And long before St. *Cyprian's* time, *Soter* Bishop of *Rome*, as the Venerable *Dionysius* Bishop of *Corinth*, (cited for it by *Eusebius*.) tells us, Managed this Power to excellent purpose, as his Predecessors, from the Apostles times had done before him. Take his own Words, for he was a very ancient Father, having flourished about an Hundred Years before St. *Cyprian*. They are in an Epistle of his to the Church of *Rome*, in which he thus speaks them. *This has been your Custom from the beginning, (i. e. ever since the Church of Rome was planted,) to do manifold good Offices to the Brethren, and send Supplies to most Churches in most Cities, for sweetning their Poverty, and refreshing those that are Condemned to the Mines. You, Romans, observe the Custom of the Romans handed down to you by your Fathers; which Custom, your blessed Bishop Soter has not only observed, but improved, &c.* What can be more clear than it is from these Words, That *Soter*, as Bishop of *Rome*, had the chief Management of the Charitable Contributions, imposing them, and disposing of them for the Relief of the Afflicted Christians of whatsoever Church? And now that I have gone higher than St. *Cyprian's* time, (tho it was not necessary for my main Argument; and to make use of it, might swell this Letter to too great a Bulk;) Let me mention another Power, which *Tertullian* (who lived before St. *Cyprian* also) in plain Terms appropriates to the Bishop. A considerable Power, a Power that is a considerable Argument of the Episcopal Sovereignty. And it is,

ἢ Euseb. H. E.
l. 4. c. 23.

Sixthly, The Power of Indicting Solemn Fasts, as occasion required, to all the Christians within his District. You have his Words, plain and home, upon the Marginⁱ.

ⁱ Bene autem
& quod Epi-

*scopi Univerſa Plebi jejunia mandare aſſent: Non dico de induſtria ſtipium Conſeſſendaram
ut veſtra captura eſt, ſed interdum ex aliqua ſollicitudinis Eccleſiaſtica cauſa. Tert.
De Jejun. cap. 13.*

Seventhly, A Biſhop in St. Cyprian's time, (for now I return to it,) as ſuch, had the ſole Power of Convocating his Presbyters and Deacons; all thoſe of his Clergy and People, who either ſat with him, or ſtanding gave their Suffrages, as they were aſk'd, about any thing relating to the Church. All Learned Men (even Spanhemius himſelf, our Author's diligent Searcher into Antiquity,) confeſſes this. Indeed, this was a Point on which the Unity of the Church did ſo much depend, that it could not but be a neceſſary Branch of his Prerogative, who was the Principle of Unity to, and was intruſted with, the Supreme Government of the Church. And, agreeably, we find Cornelius accounting about it in an Epiſtle to Cyprian. For there he tells, how the Presbyters and Confeſſors, who had ſided with Novatianus, turning ſenſible of their Error, came (not ſtreight to himſelf; for it ſeems they had not the confidence to do that, or rather, they would not have been allowed that freedom ſo ſuddenly; but) to his Presbyters, acknowledging their Offences, and humbly ſupplicating that they might be Pardoned, and their Eſcapes forgotten: How, when all this was narrated to him, He was pleaſed to Convocate the Presbytery: How Maximus, Urbanus, Sidonius, and Macarius, being allowed to appear, made their Acknowledgments and humble Addreſſes; and then, how after they were received in the Presbytery, the whole matter was Communicated to the People; and they again renewed their Acknowledgments before the People, confeſſing as I ſhewed before, viz. That they were convinced, that Cornelius was choſen by the Omnipotent God, and our Lord Jeſus Chriſt to be Biſhop of the moſt Holy Catholick Church; and that they were not ignorant, that, as there was but One God, One Chriſt our Saviour, and One Holy Ghoſt; ſo there ought to be only One Biſhop in a Catholick Church.

Church*. Here, I say, was a Noble Instance of a Bishop's Power in *Convocating* his Presbyters at pleasure, and managing the Affairs of the Church like a *Chief Governour*. The whole Epistle is well worth perusing. But I shall only desire you to take notice of one Thing by the way, it is, That *Cornelius* sought not the People's Consent for their Reception; no, he first received them again into the Communion of the Church, and then acquainted the People with it. I observe this, because it is another Demonstration, That what *St. Cyprian* determined from the beginning of his *Episcopacy*, was merely the effect of his own Choice, and Arbitrary Condescension, viz. To do nothing without his Peoples Consent; This, I say, was not a Thing he was bound to do by the Rules of his *Episcopacy*, for then *Cornelius* had been as much bound as he.

igitur actu ad M E perlato, placuit contra hi Presbyterium — His ita Gessu in Presbyterium venerant — Summis precibus desiderantes ut ea que ante fuerant Gesta in Oblivionem cederent — Quod erat consequens, omnis hic actus populo fuerat infinuandus, ut & ipsos viderent, in Ecclesia constitutos — Magnus fraternitatis concursus factus est. — Una erat vix omnium gratias Deo agendum — Et ut ipsorum propria verba desigum, nos inquit Cornelium Episcopum sanctissima Ecclesia, &c. Ep. 49. p. 92, 93.

After these Persons were so solemnly Reconciled to the Church, they themselves, by a Letter, gave an Account of it to *St. Cyprian*; an Account, I say, which might bring more Light to the whole Matter, if it needed any. *We are certain, say they, most dear Brother, that you will rejoyce with us, when you know, that all Mistakes are forgotten, and we are Reconciled to Cornelius OUR BISHOP, and to all the Clergy; to the Great Contentment and Good Liking of the whole Church*.*

V Certissimus, Frater carissime, te quoque nobiscum pari voto congruere, nos habito Consilio, utilitatibus Ecclesie & paci magis Coniunctos, omnibus rebus pretermisissis, & iudicio Dei reservatis, cum Cornelio EPISCOPO NOSTRO pariter & cum Uniuerso clero pacem fecisse cum Gaudio etiam Uniuersae Ecclesie, prona etiam omnium Caritate. Ep. 53. p. 98.

But you may say, Did not the Roman Presbytery Conveen, during the *Vacancy*, after the Death of *Fabianus*? And did not the *Presbytery* of *Carthage* meet frequently, during the time of *St. Cyprian's* *Secession*? How then can it be said, That the Bishop had the sole Power of *Convocating* Presbyters? I answer, 'Tis true, it was so in both Cases: But how? To begin with the latter; There was no Meeting of the Clergy at *Carthage*, during *St. Cyprian's* *Secession*, without his Authority: And therefore we find, when he retired, he left a

Dele-

Delegated Power with his Presbyters and Deacons, or an Allowance, call it as you will, to meet and manage the Affairs of the Church, as occasion should require; but still, so as that they could do nothing of Moment without first Consulting him; and nothing, but what was of ordinary Incidence, is Regulated by the Canons. This we learn from many of his Epistles: Thus, in his Fifth Epistle directed to his Presbyters and Deacons, Because he could not be present himself, he required them Faithfully and Religiously to discharge both his Office and their own^m. Which not only imports, that they had distinct Offices from his, but also, in express Terms, settles a Delegation on them. He bespeaks them after the same manner in his 12th Epistleⁿ. And more Authoritatively yet, Ep. 14. where he not only Exhorts, but Commands them to perform the Office of Vicars to him^o. But then, how warmly he resented it, when some of them ventured beyond the Limits of the Allowance he had given them; when they began to encroach on his Prerogatives; when they presumed to meddle in Matters for which they had no Allowance, and which were not in the common Road, nor Regulated by the Canons, you shall hear to purpose by and by. And from what I have already said, the other Case, That of the Presbytery's Meeting in the time of a Vacancy, may be easily cleared also; for tho' they might meet, yet all they could do, was to provide all they could for the Peace and Safety of the Church, by determining in Ruled Cases; just as may be done by inferior Magistrates in all other Corporations, or Societies, in the time of an Inter-Reign; but they could make no new Rules: And there were several other Things they could not do; as I shall also shew fully within a little. In the mean time, having mentioned how St. Cyprian, in his Absence, gave a Delegation to his Clergy, and Constituted them his Vicars; let me give you one Example of it, which may well deserve to pass for another Instance of Acts that were peculiar to himself: And that is,

Eighthly, His Delegating, not his Presbyters in common, but two of them only, viz. Rogatianus and Numidicus, with two Bishops, Caldonius and Herculanus, not only to consider the State of the Poor, and of the Clergy at Carthage; but to

Et quoniam
mibi interesse
nunc non per-
mittit Loci
conditio, Peto
vos pro fide &
Religione ve-
stra, fungami-
ni illic & ve-
stris partibus
& meis. Ep. 5.
p. 10.
ⁿ Atque uti-
nam Loci &
Gradus mei
conditio per-
mitteret ut
IPSE nunc
presens esse
possem —
Sed Officium
MEUM vestra
diligentia Re-
presentet. Ep. 12.
p. 27.
^o Hortor &
Mando —
Vice mea fon-
gami. Ep. 14.
p. 31.

P Cum ego
 vos pro me
 Vicarios mi-
 serim —
 Felicissimus —
 — accipiat
 sententiam
 quam prior
 dixit, ut Ab-
 stentum se a
 nobis sciat :
 — Sed &
 Augendus

sententiam ferat — Et quisquis se conspirationi & factioni ejus adjunxerit, sciat se in Ecclesia nobiscum non esse Communicaturum. Ep. 41. p. 79.

^a Caldonius cum Herculano & Victore Collegis (i. e. Episcopis) item cum Rogatiano & Numidico Presbyteris, Cypriano salutem. Abstiniimus communicatione Felicissimum & Augendum, &c. Ep. 42. p. 81.

pronounce his Sentence of Excommunication against *Felicissimus* and *Augendus*, and all that should joyn themselves to that *Faction* and *Conspiracy*^p. Which *Delegation* was accordingly accepted of, and the Sentence put in Execution, as we learn by the Return, which these four *Delegates*, together with another Bishop called *Victor*, made to our Holy Martyr^q. I might have easily collected more Instances of *Powers* and *Faculties* which were peculiar to a *Bishop* in St. Cyprian's time, and which could not be pretended to by *Presbyters*: But these may be sufficient for a Sample, especially considering that more, perhaps, may be discovered in the Prosecution of the next Thing I promised to make appear, which was,

II. That in every thing relating to the Government and Discipline of the Church, the Bishop had a *Negative* over all the other *Church-Governours* within his *District*. He had the *Supreme Power* of the *Keys*. No Man could be admitted into the Church; no Man could be thrust out of the Church; none Excommunicated could be admitted to Penance, nor Absolved nor Restored to the Communion of the Church; no Ecclesiastical Law could be made, nor Rescinded, nor Dispensed with, without him. In short, all Ecclesiastical Discipline depends upon the *Sacraments*, and neither *Sacrament* could be Administrated without his *Allowance*. If this Point, well proved, does not evince, That a *Bishop*, in St. Cyprian's time, was a real *Prelate*, and stood in a real *Superiority* above all other *Church Officers*, I must despair of ever proving any thing. And I must despair of ever proving any thing, if I prove not this Point.

1. To begin with *Baptism*, the Sacrament by which Persons are admitted into the Church: That no Man could be Baptized without the Bishop's Consent, has as much Evidence as can be well required for any *Matter of Fact*. For,

First,

First, St. Cyprian could not have expressed any thing more fully, or more plainly, than he has done this. To omit that Testimony which he gives in his *Exhortation to Maryrdom*, where he says, *Bishops, by our Lord's Allowance, give the first Baptism to Believers*. Let us turn over to Ep. 73. in which he insists directly to this purpose. The Question was, Whether Baptism performed by Hereticks, or Schismatics, was Valid? St. Cyprian affirmed it was not. His Conclusion was such, as required some other Argument to support it, than his own Authority. It was therefore needful, that he should attempt to prove it; and that from received and acknowledged Principles. Now consider his Argument, I shall give it in his own Words as near as I can Translate them. 'Tis manifest, says he, where, and by whom, the Remission of Sins can be given, which is given in Baptism. For, our Lord gave, first, to Peter (on whom he built his Church, thereby insinuating and demonstrating the Original of Unity,) that Power, That whatsoever he should loose on Earth, should be loosed in Heaven: And then, after his Resurrection, he gave it to all his Apostles, when he said, As my Father hath sent me, &c. (Joh. 20. v. 21, 22, 23.) Whence we learn, that none can Baptize Authoritatively, and give Remission of Sins, but the BISHOPS, and those who are FOUNDED in the Evangelical Law, and our Lord's Institution: And, that nothing can be Bound or Loosed out of the Church, seeing there's none, there, who has the Power of Binding or Loosing. Further; Dearest Brother, we want not Divine War-rant for it, when we say, That God hath disposed all Things by a certain Law, and a proper Ordinance; and that none can USURP any thing against the BISHOPS, all being subject to them: For Corah, Dathan, and Abiram, attempted to assume to themselves a Priviledge of Sacrificing against Moses and Aaron the Priest, and they were Punished for it, because it was unlawful. Thus St. Cyprian argued; and the force of his Argument lies visibly in this, That Baptism performed by Hereticks or Schismatics cannot be Valid, because not performed by the Bishop, nor with his Allowance. Now whatever comes of his Inference, sure, it had been Ridiculous in him to have so Reasoned, if his Antecedent had not been a received Principle.

*Not tantum
qui Domino
permittente pri-
mum Baptisma
credentibus da-
mus. P. 168.*

*Manifestum
est, aut ubi &
per quos Remis-
sa peccatorum
dari potest, que
in Baptismo
scilicet datur;
nam Petro pri-
mum Dominus,*

*super quem edificavit Ecclesiam, & unde unitatis Originem instituit & ostendit, potestatem
astam dedit ut id solveretur in Cælis quod ille solvisset in Terris. Et post Resurrectionem quoque*

ad Apostolos loquitur, dicens, Sicut misit me Pater, &c. — Unde intelligimus non nisi in Ecclesia prepositis, & in Evangelica lege ac Dominica Ordinatione fundatis, licere Baptizare, & Remissum peccatorum dare: Foris autem nec ligari aliquid posse nec solvi, ubi non sit qui aut ligari possit, aut solvere. Nec hoc F. C. sine Scripturæ divine Auctoritate proponimus, ut dicamus certa lege cuncta esse disposita nec posse quenquam contra Episcopos & Sacerdotes Usurpare sibi aliquid, quod non sit sui juris & potestatis; nam & Chore, & Dathan & Abyron, contra Moylen & Aaron Sacerdotem sacrificandi sibi Licentiam Usurpare conati sunt: Nec tamen quod illicite ausi sunt, impune fecerunt. Ep. 73: p. 201.

Neither was St. Cyprian singular in this, for Firmilian Bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia is as plain, saying, (as I have cited him before) That the Bishops, who Govern the Church, possess the Power of Baptism, Confirmation, and Ordination. And Fortunatus Bishop of Thuraborus, another of St. Cyprian's Contemporaries, in his Suffrage at the Council of Carthage, is as plain as either Cyprian or Firmilian. Jesus Christ, says he, our Lord and God, the Son of God the Father and Creator, built his Church upon a Rock, and not upon Heresie, and gave the Power of Baptizing to Bishops, and not to Hereticks, &c.* Indeed, before St. Cyprian's time, we have Tertullian, who spent most of his Days in the Second Century, and who, in his Book about Baptism, against Quintilla, to the Question, *Who may Baptize?* answers positively, *The High-Priest, who is the Bishop, hath the Power of Baptizing; and after him, or in Subordination to him, Presbyters and Deacons, but not without the BISHOP'S AUTHORITY*." And before him, we have the Apo-

* Jesus Christus Dominus noster & Deus, Dei Patris & Creatoris Filius,

stolical Ignatius, who spent almost all his Days in the First Century, and who says in express Terms, *That it is not lawful to Baptize without the Bishop*."

super Petram edificavit Ecclesiam suam, non super Heresim; & Potestatem Baptizandi Episcopis dedit, non Hereticis: Quare qui extra Ecclesiam sunt, & contra Christum stantes, oves ejus & Gregem spargunt, Baptizari non possunt. Conc. Carth. Suff. 17.

"Dandi quidem jus habet summus Sacerdos qui est Episcopus; dehinc Presbyteri & Diaconi, non tamen sine Episcopi Auctoritate. Cap. 17.

Ὁὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλος ἢ ὁ ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐκκλησιαστικοῦ καὶ βαπτίζων, &c. Ad Smyrn. p. 6.

2. A Bishop, in St. Cyprian's time, had as much Power about the Holy Eucharist: No Presbyter within his District could Administer it without his Leave, or against his Interdict. St. Cyprian's Testimonies to this purpose are innumerable. Let me give you only One or Two, for Instance; Thus in his

16th Epistle written to his Presbyters and Deacons, he re-
sents it highly; that some of his Presbyters should have dared
to admit the Lapsed to the Sacrament without his Allowance.
Such, says he, deny me the Honour of which by Divine Right I am
possessed, &c. Indeed, the 15th, 16th, and 17th Epistles, are
to this purpose. And in his 59th Epistle, having cited
Mal. 2. v. 1, 2. he Reasons thus against all such Presbyters as
presumed to Celebrate the Eucharist without the Bishop's al-
lowance. Is Glory given to God, when his Majesty and Discipline
is so contemned, that, when He says, He is Angry and full of Wrath
against such as Sacrifice to Idols, and when He threatens them
with everlasting Pains and Punishments, Sacrilegious Persons should
presume to say, Think not on the Wrath of God: Fear not the Di-
vine Judgments: Knock not at the Church of Christ: That
they should cut off Repentance, and the Confession of Sins; and
PRESBYTERS CONTEMNING and TRAMPLING
ON THEIR BISHOPS, should preach Peace with Decei-
ving Words, and give the Communion, &c. *

Hi sublato
honore quem mo-
bis beati Mar-
tyres — Scr-
vant, contemptis
Domini leges —
quam iidem
Martyres —
tenendam mau-
dant — ante
reditum no-
strum Commu-
nificant cum
lapsis, & offer-
rant, & Eucha-
ristiam tra-

Ep. 16. p. 38. * Honor ergo datur Deo, quando sic Dei Majestas & Censura con-
temnitur ut cum se ille indignavit & irasci Sacrificantiis dicat, & cum penas aeternas & sap-
plia perpetua comminetur: Proponatur a Sacrilegis & dicatur; ne ira cogitetur Dei; ne ti-
meatur judicium Domini; ne possit ad Ecclesiam Christi: Sed sublata penitentia, nec ulla ex
homologesi Crimini facta, Despectis Episcopis atque Calcatis, Pax a Presbyteris verbis
fallacibus praedicetur & Communicatio a non Communicantibus offeratur. Ep. 59. p. 135.

And, 'tis a Passage very remarkable to this purpose, which
we read in an Epistle of Dionysius of Alexandria to Fabius of
Antioch, (both St. Cyprian's Contemporaries) in which he
tells, how one Serapion, an aged Man, after a long Perseve-
rance in the Christian Faith, had first fallen from it in time of
Persecution, and then into a deadly Sickness: How, after
he had been dumb and senseless for some Days, recovering
some use of his Tongue, he called quickly for one of the
Presbyters of Alexandria, (for he lived in that City) that he
might be Absolved, and have the Sacrament, being perswa-
ded he should not die till he should be Reconciled to the
Church: And how the Presbyter being sick also, sent the Sa-
crament to him: But by what Right or Authority? By Dio-
nysius the Bishop. For, says he, I had C O M M A N D
that any Lapsed, if in danger of Death, especially if he was an
humble Suppliant for it, should be Absolved, that he might go out
of

Ministerium transgressi contra Aaron Sacerdotem, qui Sacerdotium legitimum Dignatione Dei atque Ordinatione percipnat, Sacrificandi sibi Licentiam vindicarent, Divinitus percussi— Nec posuerunt rata esse & perficere Sacrificia, irreligiose & illicite contra jus Divina dispositionis oblata.— Et tamen illi Schisma non fecerant; nec foras egressi— Quod nunc hi Ecclesiam scindentes, & contra pacem & unitatem Christi rebelles, Cathedram sibi constituere, & primatum assumere, & Baptizandi atque Offerendi licentiam vindicare cunctantur.
Ep. 69. p. 184.

3. Considering that, as I have fully proved, a Bishop was, then, the *Principle of Unity* to the Church; that he was *Chief Governour* of the Church; and that, by consequence, the *Supreme Power* of the *Keys* could not but belong to him: Considering that the Church was a *Visible Society*; that he was the *Visible Head* of that *Visible Society*; and, by consequence, that it belonged to him as such, to take care that *Society* might suffer no *Detriment*: Considering these Things, I say, it was highly reasonable, that he should have the *Chief Power* of *Dispensing* the *Sacraments*: Such a *Power*, as that *neither* might be *dispensed* without him. What can be more *Detrimental* to a *Society*, especially such a *Society* as a *Christian Church*, than *admitting Unworthy Persons* to the *Privileges* of it? Or *allowing* them to *continue* in it? Or *restoring* them to their *Membership* in the *Society*, after they have been *justly thrust* from it, without considering whether they have given any *Evidence* of a *serious Reformation*? And who so proper to *judge* of these Matters, as the *Chief Governour* of the *Society*? And now,

Having thus made it evident, that a *Bishop*, in *St. Cyprian's* time, had a *Negative* over all other Church-Officers within his *District*, in the grand Concern of *Dispensing* both *Sacraments*; and that *neither* could be *Administred* without him, or against his *Authority*, I might fairly supersede the trouble of making either a *Minute* or a *laborious Demonstration* of his *Sovereign Interest* in the *Acts* of *Excommunication*, or *injoining Penances*, or *reconciling Penitents*, or *making*, or *rescinding*, or *dispensing* with *Ecclesiastical Laws* or *Canons*; in a word, in every thing relating to the *Government* or *Discipline* of the Church. All these *Acts* depend upon the *Sacraments*. His *Negative* therefore, about the *Dispensation* of the *Sacraments*, had been *in vain*, and to no purpose, if he had not had a *Negative* likewise about all these *Acts*. Besides,
you

you will not readily say, I think, that he could have had a *Greater Trust* by having a *Negative*, in any other Matter than in the Dispensing of the Sacraments. Having that, therefore, he might well be *intrusted* with a *Negative* in all other Things, either of *equal* (if any such can be imagined) or *lesser* Importance on which, the Order, the Subsistence, the Unity, the Peace, the Purity, the Prosperity, or whatsoever Interest of the Church could any way depend. Yet that I may give you all possible satisfaction, I shall proceed a little further, and give you, by way of Historical Deduction, such an account of *Powers* lodged, *e. g.* in *St. Cyprian's* Person, as you may fairly judge thereby, concerning the Preheminences of Bishops in his Time.

The most current Account we have about him, is, that he was not Converted to Christianity, at least, not Baptized, till the Year 246. That he was Ordain'd a Presbyter, *Anno* 247; and Bishop of *Carthage*, *Anno* 248. Chronologists do generally agree in this last Step of his Preferment. Now, as we learn both from himself, and from *Pontius* his Deacon, some of the *Carthaginian* Clergy were mighty Enemies to his Promotion^a. Belike, they took it ill, that he, so lately converted to the Faith, so lately made a Presbyter, should have been preferred to themselves. However it was, certain it is, as I said, that they appeared against him with all their might and main. But the People were so Generally and so Zealously for him, to have him their Bishop, that these his Enemies were overpowered. Made Bishop he was; and he was a Person so well Qualified, so Eminent in every Virtue, and withal so Strict and Cautious in his Life and Government, after he was made Bishop, that it was not easie for the Mutineers to wreck their Malice on him: But this was so far from softening them, and bringing them to a better temper, that, on the contrary, it embittered them the more, and made them the more watchful of all Opportunities to breed him Troubles, and disturb his Government. At last, they catch'd hold of one, and that a very dangerous one, in the time of the *Decian* Persecution.

This Persecution beginning towards the end of the Year 249, and lasting for a full Year; coming on the Church, after a long Peace, with a surprizing Violence, had very
sad

^a Vide Ep. 43.
& vit. Cypri.
postea cit.

bad Effects. Vast numbers turned Apostates, Renouncing the Holy Faith, and Sacrificing to the Heathen Idols: And *Cyprian* himself, commanded by God, had retired from *Cartbage* till there should be some Relentment of the Fury of the Persecution. Here, I say, his subtle Enemies found their so long wished Opportunity: For, the *Lapsed*, so soon as the Hazard was over, resumed their Christian Profession, and turned mighty forward, if not furious, to be restored to the Communion of the Church. Tho' they knew full well, that they were bound by the *Canons* to have continued, for a long time, in the state of *Penitents*; yet they thought their Numbers, and perhaps their Qualities, might overpower the *Canons*, and claim *Indulgences* and *Dispensations*. - With them struck in those Clergy-men, who had still retained the old Grudges against *St. Cyprian's* Promotion, encouraging their Presumptions. They knew, he was a Man of Principles, and had a mighty Zeal for the real Interests of Christianity; and, by consequence, that he would stand Resolutely by the *Canons* of the Church, and be clear, that the *Lapsed* should perfect their *Terms of Penance*: They saw the Eagerness of the *Lapsed* to be sooner reconciled, than the *Canons* allowed: They resolved therefore to fall in with them, thinking that thereby they should effectually put a Thorn in his Foot; they should enflame the *Lapsed*, and their Relations, perchance, the great Body of the People against him. But this was not all.

It was not enough for them themselves to encourage the *Lapsed* in their Petulancies: The Bishops *Prelation* over Presbyters was then so Notorious, that, as malicious as they were, they had not Impudence enough to set up *theirs* in opposition to his Authority, and Reconcile the *Lapsed* to the Church, meerly upon the score of their own Credit, against his Will and Orders; and therefore, they fell upon another Project. If it was possible for any other to stand up against the Bishops Authority, it was that of the *Martyrs* and *Confessors*. These, for their Faith and Patience; their fervent Zeal, and fragrant Graces; their glorious Courage, and good Example; that they might Persevere themselves, and others might be encouraged to follow their Patern; were held in mighty Reputation. They were reputed as dearer to God, and in a closer

I

Com-

Communion with him, and nearer Approximation to him, than Christians of the common size: And their Intercessions had been in use of being much regarded in former Persecutions. These, therefore, as the only Persons whose Credit could be feasily put in the Ballance with the Bishops Authority, the Holy Man's Supplanters instigated to espouse the Quarrel of the Lapsed; to become their Patrons, for having themselves Absolved against the Bishop's Resolutions. And truly, some of them were so far wrought upon, as to turn Zealous for it: And, armed with their Authority, these discontented Presbyters adventured to *Absolve* the *Lapsed*, and receive them to the Sacrament, without the Bishop's Allowance. Now consider what followed, and speak your Conscience, and tell me, if St. Cyprian was not more than either *Single Presbyter*, or *Presbyterian Moderator*.

Tho' he was one of the mildest and most humble Men that ever lived; yet, so soon as this was told him, where he was, in his Retirement, he was not a little alarm'd: The Practice was surprizing, and the Presumption *new*, as well as *bold*: The like had never been done before in any Christian Church: And such preposterous Methods clearly tended to shake all the Foundations of Order and good Discipline: And therefore he thought it high time for him, if he could, to give the Check to such irregular and unexampled Methods. In short, he drew his Pen, and wrote Three notable Epistles; *one* to the *Martyrs* and *Confessors*; *Another* to his *Clergy*; and a *third* to his *People*: Insisting, in each of them, upon the Novelty and Unwarrantableness of the Course was taken; the Dishonours and Indignities were done himself by it; and the great Mischiefs and fatal Consequences might, nay would, unavoidably follow upon it, if it were not forborn. More particularly,

In that to the *Martyrs* and *Confessors*, he told them, *That his Episcopal Care, and the Fear of God, compelled him to Admonish them, That, as they had devoutly and courageously kept the Faith, so they ought, suitably, to be observant of Christ's Holy Laws and Discipline: That, as it became all Christ's Soldiers to obey their General's Commands; so it was their Duty, in a special manner, to be Examples to others: That he had thought, the Presbyters and Deacons, who were with them, might have taught them*

so much: But that now, to his extream Grief, be understood, they had been so far from doing that; that, on the contrary, some of them, especially some Presbyters, misber minding the Fear of God, nor the Honour of their Bishop, had industriously misled them. He complain'd mightily of the Presumption of such Presbyters, that against all Law and Reason, they should have dared to Reconcile the Lapsed without his Consent. That herein they were more Criminal than the Lapsers themselves: That it was somewhat Excusable in the Lapsed to be earnest for an Absolution; considering the uncomfortable State they were in, so long as they were denied the Communion of the Church: But it was the Duty of Office-bearers in the Church to do nothing rashly, lest, in stead of Pastors, they should prove Worriers of the Flock, &c. And then he told these Martyrs and Confessors, how far their Priviledges reached: All they could do, was, by way of humble Supplication, to Petition the Bishop for a Relaxation of the Rules of Discipline: But they had neither Power to Command him, nor Grant Indulgences without him^b. Indeed, this he told them frequently, and ^b Sollicitudo ther^c.

tissimi & Beatissimi Martyres, admonere vos literis nostris, ut a quibus tam devote & fortiter servatur fides Domino, ab iisdem Lex quoque & Disciplina Domini reservetur. Nam cum omnes milites Christi custodire oporteat præcepta imperatoris sui, tum vos magis præceptis ejus obtemperare plus convenis, qui exemplum ceteris facti estis & virtutis & timoris Dei. Et crediderant quidem Presbyteros & Diaconos qui illic præsentis sunt, monere vos & instruere plenissime circa Evangelii legem, sicut in præteritum semper sub Antecessoribus nostris factum est. — Sed nunc cum maximo animi dolore cognosco, non tantum illic vobis non suggeri Divina Præcepta, sed adhuc potius impediri, ut ea — a quibusdam Presbyteris resolvantur, qui nec timorem Dei, nec Episcopi honorem cogitantes — Contra Evangelii legem — ante actam penitentiam, ante exomologesin gravissimi atque extremi delicti factam, ante manum ab Episcopo & clero in penitentiam impositam, offerre pro illis, & Eucharistiam dare, i. e. sanctum Domini Corpus profanare audeant. — Et Lapsis quidem potest in hoc venia concedi: Quis enim non mortuus revivificari properet? Quis non ad salutem suam venire festinet? Sed præpositum est præceptum tenere, & vel properantes, vel ignorantes instruere, ne qui ovium Pastores esse debeat, Lanii fiant. — Petitiones & desideria vestra Episcopo serventi, &c. Ep. 15. p. 33, 34.

^c Vide De Lapsis, p. 129, 131, 138. Ep. 16. p. 37. Ep. 17. p. 39. Ep. 36. p. 70.

In that to his Presbyters and Deacons, he wrote in a yet more resenting Strain. He told them, He had long kept his Patience, and held his Peace; but their immoderate Presumption and Temerity would suffer him no longer to be silent. For what a dreadful Prospect, says he, must we have of the Divine Ven-

grace, when some Presbyters, neither mindful of the Gospel, nor their own Stations, nor regarding the future Judgments of God, nor the Bishop, who, for the time, is set over them; dare attempt what was never attempted before, under any of my Predecessors, namely, so to Affront and Contemn their Bishop, as to assume all to themselves? And then he proceeds to tell them, how he could overlook and bear with the Indignity done to his Episcopal Authority, if there were no more in it: But the course they followed was so wicked; they were so injurious to the Lapsed whom they presumed to Reconcile so Uncanonicaly; their Pride and Popularity were so apparent in their Method; it was such a Crime, so to Expose the Martyrs to Envy, and set them at Variance with their Bishop, &c. that he could stifle it no longer. In short, all over the Epistle he wrote like a Bishop, and concluded it with a Peremptory Threatning of a present Suspension from the Exercise of their Office, and then an Infliction of further Censures when he should retire from his Retirement, if they should Persevere in such a Lawless Course^d.

^d *Diu patientiam meam tenui. F.C. quasi*

verecundum silentium nostrum proficeret ad quietem. Sed cum quorundam immoderata & abrupta presumptio, temeritate sua, & honorem Martyrum, & Confessorum pudorem, & Plebis universa tranquillitatem turbare conetur, tacere ultra non oportet. — Quid enim non periculum metuere debemus de offensa Domini; quando aliqui de Presbyteris, nec Evangelii, nec Loci sui memores; sed neque futurum Domini iudicium, neque nunc sibi Præpositum Episcopum cogitantes, quod nunquam omnino sub antecessoribus factum est, cum Contumelia & Contemptu Præpositi totum sibi vindicare? Contumeliam Episcopatus nostri dissimulare & ferre possem, sicut dissimulaui semper & peruli, sed dissimulandi nunc Locus non est, quando decipiatur fraternitas nostra, a quibusdam vestrum; qui dum sine rationis restituenda salutis plaussibiles esse cupiunt, magis Lapis obstant. — Exponunt deinde invidia Beatos Martyres, & Gloriosos servos Dei cum Dei Sacerdote committunt. — Interim Temerarii & Incauti & Turbidi quidam inter vos, qui hominem non cogitent, vel Deum timeant; scientes quoniam si ultra in iisdem perseveraverint, utar ea admonitione, qua me uti Dominus iubet, ut interim prohibeantur offerre; Asturi & apud nos & apud Confessores ipsos, & apud Plebem universam, causam suam, cum Domino permittente, in sinum matris Ecclesie Colligi caperimus. Ep. 16. p. 36, 37, 38. imo lege totam Epist.

In that to his People, he proceeded on the same Principles; condemned these Presbyters, who had acted so disorderly, not reserving to the Bishop the Honour of his Chair and Priesthood: Told them, That these Presbyters ought to have taught the People otherwise; Laid to their Charge the Affectation of Popularity; and required such of the People as had not fallen, to take Pains upon the Lapsed; to try to bring them

the Cyprianic Age.

them to a better Temper; to perswade them to hearken to his Counsel, and wait his Return, &c.

* *Audite tamen quosdam de*

Presbyteris nec Evangelii memores — Nec Episcopo honorem Sacerdotii sui & Cathedrae reservantes, jam cum Lapis communicare cepisse — Vos quidem Nostri Presbyteri & Diaconi numerum dabuerant, ut commendatæ sibi Oves forent. — Ego Plebis nostræ & quietem meam pariter & timorem, qui in satisfactione Dei & deprecatione vigilavit, nisi illos quidem de Presbyteris GRATIFICANTES decerpissent. Vel vos itaque singulos regite, & Consilio ac Moderatione vestra, & secundum divina præcepta Lapforum animas temperate, &c.

Ep. 17. p. 39.

Here were three Epistles written, I think, in plain Prelatick Stile; sure, neither in the Stile of Single Presbyter, nor Presbyterian Moderator: Especially if we consider the very next, written to his Presbyters and Deacons upon the same Principles, still. He had written to them several times before from the Place of his Retirement, but had received no Answer from them. Now consider how he Resents this, and, Resenting it, asserts his own Episcopal Authority; his own Sovereign Power in Ecclesiastick Matters: For thus he begins; I wonder, dear Brethren, that you have returned no Answers to the many Letters I have sent you; especially considering, that now, in my Retirement, you ought to inform me of every thing that happens; that so I may, advisedly and deliberately, give Orders concerning the Affairs of the Church. Let any Man lay these four Letters together, and weigh them impartially, and then let him judge if St. Cyprian wrote in the Stile of Parity, if he claim'd not a Sovereign Power, a Negative, to himself, over all the Christians, Presbyters as well as others, living within his District.

* *Miror vos, P. C. ad multas Epistolas meas quas ad vos frequenter misi, nunquam mihi rescripsisse, cum fraternitatis nostræ vel utilitas vel necessitas sic utique gubernatur, si a vobis instruiti, rerum gerendarum Consilium limare possimus.*

Ep. 18. p. 40.

But did not Cyprian shew too much Zeal in this Cause? Possibly, he attempted to stretch his Power a little too far; as afterwards many did: He was a Holy and Meek Man, but such may be a little too High. So I read, indeed, in a late Book. But it seems, the Author has found himself very fore put to it when he said so: For how can one not be fore put to it, when he cannot escape but by seeking for Refuge in a Reconciliation between Pride and Patience, Superciliousness and Self-denial, Huffyeness and Humility, Carnal Height and Christian Holiness? But to let this pass,

* *Rational Defence of Non-Conformity,*
p. 179.

Had

Had that Author any solid Ground for saying so? Or rather, had it been possible for him to have said so, had he had but an ordinary Acquaintance with St. Cyprian, or his *Epistles*? Charge Pride on the *Humble Cyprian*! Cyprian, who was so very *Humble*, that from the Conscience of his own Nothingness, he has still been looked upon as a *Patern of Humility*! Cyprian, whose *Humility* would not allow him almost to speak in the *Stile of Authority*, even to *Female Laicks*^b! Cyprian, who was perswaded, that God would hear none but the *Humble and Quiet*^l! Cyprian, who believed, that none could be a *Christian*, and withal, be *Proud and Haughty*^k! Who insisted on his own *Humility* in that very *Epistle*, for which that Author charges him with *Pride*^l! Who, if in any thing, *Gloried* most in his *Humble and Bashful Modesty*^m! Who, when accused of *Pride*, could Appeal not only to all *Christians*, but even to the *Heathen Infidels*, as *Witnesses* of his *Innocence*ⁿ! Cyprian, who had this Great Testimony from some, of his *Contemporaries*, That he was the *Greatest Preacher*, the *Most Eloquent Orator*, the *Wise* in *Counsel*, the *Simplest* in *Patience*, the *Most Charitable* in *Alms*, the *Holiest* in *Abstinence*, the *Humblest* in *Obligingness*, and the *Most Innocent* in every Good *Action*^o! And from others, That he had a *Candid and a Blessed Breast*! &c.^p In a word, Cyprian, whose *Humility* was such, that, if we may believe his *Deacon Pontius*, He fled and lurk'd when they were going to make him a *Bishop*^q! Such, that when *St. Augustine*, many years after, was pressed with his *Authority*, he came off with this, *The Authority of Cyprian doth*

^b Ad has loquimur, has ad hortamur affectione potius quam potestate: Non quod extremi & minimi & humilitatis nostra admodum conscii, aliquid ad censuram licentia vindicemus, &c. De Hab. Virg.

p. 94.

^l Si nos Dominus humiles & quietos — Conspexerit, tutos ab inimici infestationibus exhibebit. Ep. 11. p. 26.

^k Et quisquam per ipsum (Christum) nunc, atque in ipso vivens extollere se audet & superbire? Ep. 33. p. 30.

^l Vide Superius Citata, ex Ep. 16.

^m Nec nos putes, F. C. nostra & humana conscribere, at ultronea voluntate hoc nobis audacter assumere, cum Mediocritatem nostram semper humili & verecunda moderatione tenuamus. Ep. 63. p. 148.

ⁿ Humilitatem meam & Fratres omnes, & Gentiles quoque optime norunt & diligunt. Ep. 66. p. 166.

^o Et enim omnibus in Tractatu major, in Sermonem facundior, in Consilio sapientior, in patientia simplicior, in Operibus largior, in Abstinentia sanctior, in Obsequio humilior, & in actu bono innocentior. Ep. 77. p. 234.

^p — Petrus illud tuum Candidum ac Beatum — Ep. 78. p. 235. — De Animi tui candore — Ep. 79. p. 236.

^q Pontius in vi. a Cyp. p. 3.

not fright me, because the Humility of Cyprian encourages me: Such a Person was Cyprian; And yet so Proud was he, for sooth, for doing his Duty; for asserting his Episcopal Authority, when most undutifully trampled on by his presuming Presbyters.

Non me ter-
ret Auctoritas
Cypriani, quia
reficit humili-
tas Cypriani.
August. l. 2.
De Baptismo.

What I have said, methinks, might be enough in all conscience, for defeating for ever that Uncharitable, shall I say, or Ignorant Suggestion, That it was *Pride*, perhaps, that prompted Cyprian to write so Magisterially to the Carthaginian Presbyters; yet, because a farther Discussion of it may contribute not a little for clearing up the Bishop's Negative, in St. Cyprian's time, I shall not grudge to give it you.

St. Cyprian had three sorts of People to deal with in that Controversie, which bred him so much Trouble. He had the *Lapsed* themselves; the *Martyrs* and *Confessors*; and these *Presbyters* and *Deacons*, who had encroached so much on his Episcopal Authority.

I am apt to think, the Author himself, with whom I have now to do, will not be shy to grant, That St. Cyprian, without incurring the Reputation of either Proud or Presumptuous, might have chided the *Lapsed*, as we find he did: They had Cowardly renounced their Christianity, to save their Lives and Fortunes; and the Canons subjected them to a strict and a long Penance for it: And I think, without the imputation of either *Heights* or *Humour*, one in St. Cyprian's Station might have put them in mind of the Respect they owed to the Canons of the Church, and the Governours of it. Indeed, all the *Lapsed* were not engaged in the disorderly Course. There were some of them who were sensible of their Duty, and subjected themselves to their Bishop, resolving to wait his time, and intirely to depend upon him for their Absolution, as we learn from his 33d Epistle.

His Difficulty was greater with the *Martyrs* and *Confessors*, who appeared as Patrons to the Prejudicating *Lapsed*; but neither need I insist on that, nor how he conquered them in point of Right and Argument: For, this Author told Dr. Stillingfleet, He was wholly out of the way in meddling with that Matter, seeing none ever imagined that every Martyr had Church Power. Tho' I must tell you, Sir, That whoso reads St. Cyprian's Works, and particularly observes the State and Ma-

The Principles of

Management of this whole Controversie about the *Lapsed*, cannot but be convinced, that the Reputation and Authority of *Martyrs* and *Confessors*, made a far greater Figure in it, than the Reputation or Authority of *Presbyters*: To come therefore to that which is the main Point with this Author,

Let us try, if *St. Cyprian stretch'd his Power too far in his Treatment of the Presbyters*, who appeared against him in this Controversie. Consider the following Steps, and then judge.

1. Consider that *St. Cyprian* doth not fall a *buffing* or *beating*, or running them down by Noise or Clamour. No, "He
 " Reasons the Case with them, and Reasons all along from
 " known and received Principles. He tells them plainly indeed, That in Presuming as they had done, they had forgotten both the *Gospel*, and their own *Station*: That he was
 " their *Superiour*: That they did not pay him the Honour
 " that was due to his *Chair* and *Character*: That the like had
 " never been attempted before by *Presbyters*, under any of
 " his *Predecessor-Bishops*: That it was a *Faction*, *Selfish Temper*, and too great *Love of Popularity* that prompted them
 " to Measures so in no wise Presidented: That he knew the
 " Secret of the Matter, and that it was the old *Grudge* against
 " his being preferred to the *Bishoprick* that byas'd them to
 " their *Insolencies*: That it belonged to him as having the
 " *Chief Power of the Keys*, as being *Bishop*, i. e. as having the
 " *visible Sovereignty* in Church Matters, to *straiten* or *slacken*
 " the *Sinews of Discipline*; to *prolong* or *shorten* the *Courses of Penance*; to *grant* *Absolutions*, and *reconcile* *Penitents*, &c. That such *Presumptions* were *Encroachments*
 " upon the very *Foundations of the Church*, to the *Subversion* whereof, their pretending to any *Power*, in opposition
 " to the *Bishops*, tended: In short, That such Practices
 " were against *Christ's Institution*, and the *Analogies of Government*, and all the *Laws of Order, Peace and Unity*:
 " And they deserved the sharpest *Censures* for them. These, I say, are a Sample of the Arguments *St. Cyprian* insisted on against those *Presbyters*; and most of them were founded on *Matter of Fact*: And now, suppose *St. Cyprian* had

had considerable *Doses* of *Pride*, yet if you will but allow him, withall, to have had some *Grains* of *Common Sense* or *Honesty*, can you so much as imagine he could have used such *Arguments*, if they had wanted *Foundation*? Would he not have been ashamed to have used them, if *he*, and not *his* Presbyters, had been guilty of the *Usurpations* he was Condemning? But what needs more? Have I not fully proved already, That a Bishop, in *St. Cyprian's* time, was the *Principle of Unity* to all the Christians, Presbyters as well as others, within his *District*? And that he was a *Sovereign* and *Peerless* Governour of the Church which he *Ruled*. And were not all his *Reasonings* founded on these *Principles*? But this is not all; for,

2. Consider that they were not all the Presbyters of *Carthage*, who were engaged in the Quarrel. No: *Regatianus*, *Britius*, *Numidicus*, and, perhaps, many more, whose Names are not transmitted to us, would never joyn with those of the *Faction*; but still continued in their Duty to *St. Cyprian*. And can we think, they would not have joyned with their Brethren for the Maintenance of their *own Rights* and *Privileges*, if *Cyprian* had been the *Usurper*? If he had been Claiming a *Sovereign Power*, without any *Pretence* of *Rights* to it? If he had been driving at a *Prelacy*, when the Government of the Church belonged to Presbyters acting in *Parity*? We learn from *St. Cyprian*. himself, That, in those Times, it was a mighty Wickedness for Men to part tamely with their Rights and Powers in *Divine Matters*. And can we think, that *Regatianus*, *Britius*, and *Numidicus*, were ignorant of this? Or, supposing that should have had small Weight with them, is Power such a gusleß Thing, that Men will easily part with it without any Reason? But to go on.

Quam periculosum sit autem in Divinis rebus ut quis cedat jure suo & potestate, &c.
Ep. 73. p. 209.

3. Even those very Presbyters and Deacons of the *Faction* came once to something like a *Duriful Submission* in the Matter. They *lower'd* their Sails, and began to *wave* Apologies, and *knit* Excuses for what they had done. They endeavoured to put a *fair Face* upon the *foul Steps* they had made: They wrote to *Cyprian*, That they had done what they could to *bridle* the Heats of the Lapsed, and oblige them to con-

tinue in their Penances, till his Return from his Retirement; but that they were so Ungovernable and Stiff, and urged a present Absolution so eagerly and irresistibly, that they were forced, in a manner, to comply with their Humours: But now seeing they found, that he, their Bishop, was so much displeased with what they had done, *they asked a FORM from him, i. e. his Will and Pleasure in the Matter*. And now, let any Man consider, whether St. Cyprian or these Presbyters had been in the Wrong before? Whether He or They had acted beyond their Lines? But I have more to tell you: For,

* *Legi literas vestras, F. C. quibus scriptis salubre Consilium vestrum non deesse fra-*

tribus nostris, ut temeraria festinatione deposita, Religiosam patientiam Deo praebeant, ut cum in unum per ejus misericordiam venerimus, de omnibus speciebus secundum Ecclesiasticam Disciplinam tractare possimus. — Quoniam tamen significastis quosdam immoderatos esse & Communicationem accipiendam festinanter urgere; Et desiderastis in hac re FORMAM a me vobis dari; &c. Ep. 19. p. 41.

4. These Presbyters, who had thus transgressed the Bounds of their Station, were generally Condemn'd for it, by their Brethren Presbyters, all the World over: At least, we have a most remarkable Instance in the Presbyters of Rome. Take it thus.

St. Cyprian being a Wise and Watchful, as well as an Holy and Humble Prelate; one, who had still before his Eyes the Conservation of the Order, the Peace, and the Unity of the Church Catholick; and perceiving that the Controversie concerning the Restitution of the Lapsed, might be of bad Influence on those great Interests, if not prudently determined; thought fit to acquaint his Brethren of the Episcopal Colledge with it, and ask their Sentiments about it: And because there was no Bishop then at Rome, he wrote to the Presbyters and Deacons, the Roman Presbytery. The Epistle is the 20th in Number. In which he deduced the whole Matter to them, and told them particularly, how he had Exerted his Episcopal Authority, in its Vigour, against such of his Presbyters as, without his Leave, had boldly and presumptuously Absolved the Lapsed, and given them the Sacrament^a. Now consider their Return to him: You have it in the 30th Epistle.

" *Item Presbyteris & Diaconibus non defuit Sacerdotii vi-*

gor, ut quidam Disciplina minus in mores, & temeraria festinatione precipites qui tam lapsi communicare jam caperant comprimerentur. Ep. 20. p. 43.

They

They begin with the Acknowledgment of his *Supream* and *Unaccountable* Power within his own *Distric*, which I observed before*: They impure it to his *Modesty* and *Caution*, ^{v Page} (not to his *Pride* and *Petulance*,) that he had been pleased to communicate his Measures to them: They approve the Course he had taken with the *Lapsed*: They compare him to the *Master* of a *Ship*, sitting at the *Helm*, who, if he *steers* not right, and keeps not a *steady Course*, especially in a *Storm*, endangers the *Ship*, and runs her upon *Rocks* or *Shelves*: And I think, the *Master* of a *Ship* doth not act in *Parity* with the rest of the *Mariners*. And further, They compare those who, at that time, endeavoured to interrupt the Course of his Discipline, *Presbyters* as well as others, to the *Tumbling Waves*; striving to shake the *Master* from the *Helm*, and expose all to the Hazards of *Shipwrack*. In plain Terms, they condemn the Course of Reconciling the *Lapsed*, so *Undutifully* and *Rebelliously*. As for themselves, they tell him, (and pray take notice of it,) That, wanting a *Bishop*, they could define nothing in the Matter: They tell him, I say, That since the Death of *Fabianus* of most Noble Memory, through the Difficulties of the Times, and the Encumbrances of their Affairs, they had not got a *Bishop* Constituted; who only could define in these Matters, and determine in the Case of the *Lapsed* with *AUTHORITY* and *Counsel***. But withal, they tell him, ^{vv} That, for their parts, they were extremely well pleased with the Course he had taken; namely, That he had resolved to do nothing rashly, to take no sudden Resolutions in a Matter of such Consequence; but to wait till God should grant him opportunity of Treating about it with others, and determining with common Advice in such a ticklish Case*: Where observe by the way, That they do not found the Wisdom of this his Resolution on any thing like the Incompetency of his

Quaquam nobis differenda hujus rei necessitas major incumbat, quibus, post excessum nobilissimæ memorie viri Fabiani, nondum est Episcopus propter re-

num & temporum difficultates constitutus, qui omnia ista moderetur, & eorum qui Lapsi sunt possit cum AUCTORITATE & Consilio habere Rationem. Ep. 30. p. 59.

Quaquam nobis in tam ingenti negotio placeat quod & tu ipse tractasti, prius Ecclesie pacem sustinendum, deinde, sic collatione Consiliorum cum Episcopis, Presbyteris, Diaconis, Confessoribus pariter ac stantibus laicis facta, Lapsorum tractare rationem. Perquam enim nobis & invidiosum & onerosum videatur, non per multos Examinare, quod per multos Commissum videatur fuisse; & unum sententiam dicere cum tam grande Crimen per multos diffusum notetur exisse; quoniam nequissimum doctissimum potest esse quod non plurimorum videbitur habuisse consensum. Ibid.

The Principles of

Power, for having determined by *himself* concerning the *Lapsed*, within his own *Diſtrict*: No, the Reason they give for it, ſuppoſes his *Power* to have been fully *Adequate* and *Competent* for that *Effect*; and, that if he had given the *final Stroke*, no body could have *Quarrel'd* it: For they inſiſt only on the *Rules of Prudence*, which, if I miſtake not, are quite, different from the *Rules of Power*. They tell him, it might prove *Invidious* and *Burdenſome* for one *Biſhop* to Determine by *himſelf*, in a *Caſe* in which all *Biſhops* were concerned; and that it was *Providently* done of him to diſſuade the Conſent of his Colleagues, that his *Decrees* might be *Approved* and *Confirmed*; That they might not be made void through the want of the *Brotherly Ratification*. Theſe are the Reasons, I ſay, for which they juſtify his *Caution*; and theſe Reasons ſuppoſe he had *Power* to have done otherwiſe, tho' not ſo *wiſely*, nor ſo *warily*. And then they tell him over again, That they had met frequently, and *conſulted* the Matter ſeriously; They had *ſoſſed* it, not only amongſt themſelves, but with ſeveral *Biſhops*, far and near, as they had *occaſion* to be in the *City*; and that ſtill the *Concluſion* was, That they ſhould attempt no *Innovations* till a *Biſhop* ſhould be ſettled: All they had *Reſolved* was, That thoſe of the *Lapsed*, whoſe *Health* might allow, ſhould continue in the *State* of the *Penitents*, till God ſhould grant them a *Biſhop*.

”*Cuius temperamenti Mod-*

ramen nos hic tenere querentes, diu, & quidem multi, & quidem cum quibuſdam *Episcopis* vicinis nobis & appropinquantibus & quor ex aliis provinciis longe poſitis *Perſecutionis* iſtius ardor eiecerat, ante *Conſtitutionem* *Episcopi* nihil innovandum putavimus, ſed *Lapſorum* curam *Medicriter* temperandam eſſe *Credidimus*, ut, interim, dum *Episcopus* dari a Deo nobis ſuſtinetur, in ſuſpenſo eorum qui *Moras* poſſunt *dilationis* ſuſtinere, cauſa teneatur. Ibid. p. 60.

Neither was this a meer *Complement* to our Holy *Martyr*: Indeed, in all this, they gave him a true Account of their *Real Sentiments* and *Principles*, as we learn from another *Epistle* of theirs, wherein they had neither *Occaſion* nor *Temptation* to *Complement* *Biſhops*. The *Epistle* is that which is the *Eighth*, amongſt *St. Cyprian's*. An *Epistle* written by them to the *Presbyters* and *Deacons* of *Carthage*; to *Persons* of their own *Rank* and *Quality*: By conſequence, an *Epistle*, in which, had they underſtood it, had the *Principles* of thoſe *Times* allowed it, they might have ſpoke their *Minds* very freely concerning the *Power* of *Presbyters*. Never had *Presbyters*, I am ſure, more *Freedom*, or better *Opportunity*, to have

have asserted their own Power, and Vindicated Parity, and Condemn'd Prelatical Usurpations, in an Epistle, than they had on that Occasion; for *Fabianus* Bishop of *Rome* was dead, and *Cyprian* Bishop of *Carthage* was retired; and so it was written by Presbyters who had no Bishop, to Presbyters in the absence of their Bishop: And yet, in that Epistle, they were so far from having any such Notions, that they said expressly, That both Themselves who wanted One, and those of *Carthage* who wanted the Presence of One, were only seemingly the Governours of those respective Churches; and only kept the Flocks, in stead of the respective Pastors, the Bishops^a. And further, telling what Pains they had been at to keep People from Apostatizing in the Day of Trial, they account how they Treated those who had fallen, particularly, that they did separate them from the Flock indeed, but so, as not to be wanting in their Duty and Assistance to them: They did what was proper for their Station: They exhorted them to continue patiently in their Penances, as being the most plausible Method for obtaining Indulgences from him who could give them^a: That is, without Controversie, from the Bishop when he should be settled. For so I read in an Epistle, written at that same time by *Celerinus* a Roman, to *Lucianus* a *Cartaginian*, and the 21st in Number among St. *Cyprian's*, that when the Cause of *Numeria* and *Candida*, two Female Lapsed, was brought before the Presbytery of *Rome*, the Presbytery commanded them to continue as they were, i. e. in the State of Penitents, till a Bishop should be Inthroned^b. And now, let any Man judge, whether, according to the Principles and Sentiments of the Presbyters of *Rome*, St. *Cyprian* or his presuming Presbyters had taken too much upon them at *Carthage*. But neither is this all yet; for,

5. These *Cartaginian* Presbyters were also Condemned by the *Roman* Martyrs and Confessors, who, tho they were in Prison, had learned the State of the Controversie, from the Accounts St. *Cyprian* had sent to *Rome*, two of them, *Moses* p. 46. and *Maximus*, being also Presbyters. These Martyrs and Confessors wrote also to St. *Cyprian*, and to the same purpose the *Roman* Clergy had done: Their Epistle is the 31st in number: In which, they not only beg with a peculiar Earnest-

^a Et cum incumbit nobis qui VIDEMUR prepositi esse, & VICE PASTORIS cum *Sedre* Gregem. Ep. 8. p. 16.

^a Sed ipsos cohortati sumus & hortamur agere penitentiam si quomodo indulgentiam poterunt recipere ab eo QUI POTEST PRÆSTARE. Ibid. p. 17.

^b Quorum jam causa audita, praeceperunt eae Praepositi tantisper sic esse, donec Episcopus Constituat. Ep. 24.

nels, That he, being so Glorious a Bishop, would pray for them; They not only lay a singular stress upon his Prayers beyond the Prayers of others, by reason of the Opinion they had of his Holy Virtues, which, I am apt to think, such Men as they would not probably have done, had they believed him to have been a Proud aspiring Prelate, that is, indeed, a Limb of Antichrist, as this Author would fain give him out to have been: But also they heartily Congratulate his discharging, so Laudibly, his Episcopal Office; and that even in his Retirement, he had made it so much his Care to acquit himself, that he had halted in no part of his Duty; and particularly, That he had suitably Censured and Rebuked, not only the Lapsed, who, little regarding the Greatness of their Guilt, had, in his Absence, extorted the Churches Peace from his Presbyters; but even these Presbyters for their profane Facility, in giving that which was Holy to Dogs, and casting Pearls before Swine, without any Regard to the Gospel. In short, They Approve his whole Proceeding, as having done nothing Unfuitable to his Character, nothing Unbecoming either an Holy or an Humble Bishop. Further yet.

c Pete ergo Cy-
priane carissi-
me, ut nos gra-

ria sua Dominus — armet & illustret — Cui enim magis hec ut pro nobis petat, mandare debemus, quam tam Glorioso Episcopo? — Ecce aliud gaudium nostrum quod in Officio Episcopatus tui, licet interim, a fratribus pro temporis conditione distractus es, tamen non defuisti — Animadvertimus enim te congruente censura & eos digne oburgasti, qui immemores delictorum suorum, pacem a Presbyteris, per absentiam tuam, f. sinata & precepti cupiditate extorssent, & ILLOS qui sine respectu Evangelii, Sanctum Domini Canibus, & Margaritae porcis, profana facilitate donassent. Ep. 31.

6. These same Carthaginian Presbyters resuming their former Boldness, and Topping it over again with their Bishop, were Excommunicated by him, and his Sentence was Approved and Ratified by all Catholick Bishops in all Catholick Churches all the World over, as shall be shewn you fully by and by. And then,

7. And lastly, That in all this Matter St. Cyprian did nothing either Proudly or Presumptuously, is evident from this, That in his Time, and long before his Time, even from the Apostles Times, it was not Lawful for Presbyters to Attempt any thing relating to the Church without the Bishop. The Presbyters and Deacons attempt nothing without the Bishop's Allowance;

lowance; for 'tis he to whom the Lord's People are committed, and 'tis he that must Account for their Souls^d, is the 39th of the Canons called Apostolical. And no doubt it was in force in St. Cyprian's time. And this was no greater Power than was assigned him by the Apostolical Ignatius, I cannot tell how many times. Take these Testimonies for a Sample. Let no Man do any thing that belongs to the Church without the Bishop. He that honoureth the Bishop, is honoured of God; but he that doth any thing in opposition to the Bishop, serveth the Devil^e. If any Man pretend to be wiser than the Bishop, (i. e. will have Things done against the Bishop's Will,) he is Corrupted^f. Let us be careful not to resist the Bishop, as we would be subject to God^h. The Spirit hath spoken, Do ye nothing without the Bishop^{hh}. 'Tis necessary that you continue to do nothing without the Bishopⁱ.

λεγον απειθησόμεθα. Can. Ap. 39. ^e Μηδεις χωρις τῷ Ἐπισκόπῳ ἢ πρεσβυτέρῳ ἀνυπότακτοι εἰς τι τῶ ἐκκλησίαν. Ignat. Epist. p. 6.

^f Ὁ πῦρ δῖσκόποι ἰσὺ θεῷ τιμῶνται: Ὁ ἀλλὰ ἐπὶ ἀκούῃ ἢ πρεσβυτέρῳ πᾶσι διατάσσεται. P. 7.

^g Καὶ εἰς γινώσκον πλεον τῷ Ἐπισκόπῳ, ἔφθαρται. P. 13.

^h Σπεύδωμεν ἵνα μὴ ἀνυπακούσῃς τῷ Ἐπισκόπῳ ἵνα ὁμοῦ μετὰ ἡμῶν σωθῶμεν. P. 20.

^{hh} Τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ἐκήρυξεν λέγων ταῦτα: Χωρις Ἐπισκόπου μηδὲν ποιῆτε. P. 43.

ⁱ Ἀναγκῶν ἐν ἔσθι ὥστε ποιῆτε ἀνευ τῷ Ἐπισκόπῳ μηδὲν πρὸς τὴν ὑμῶν. P. 47.

And now, let any of Common Sense determine, Whether there was Ground, or shadow of Ground, for insinuating that St. Cyprian shewed too much Zeal in this Cause, or attempted to stretch his Power a little too far, (indeed, it had not been a little, but very much, nay monstrously too far, had those of Parity been then the current Principles,) or was a little too high in this Matter? But if there was no Ground to say so, if it was contrary to all the then current Principles, and to the common Sentiments of all Catholick Christians, nay, even to the Convictions of all Honest, Orderly, Dutiful, and Conscientious Presbyters, who then lived, to say so: If thus it was, I say, and 'tis hard to prove any Matter of Fact more evidently than I have proved that it was thus; then, I think, it follows by good Consequence, not only that this Author was a little in the wrong to St. Cyprian, when he said so; but also,

also, that, in St. Cyprian's time, a Bishop had fairly a *Negative* over his Presbyters, which was the Thing to be demonstrated. And so I proceed to the next Thing proposed, namely,

III. That all the other Church-Governours within his District, Presbyters as well as others, were, in St. Cyprian's time, *subject to the Bishop's Authority*, and *obnoxious to his Discipline*; I do't think you very sharp sighted, if you have not seen this already. Yet that I may give you all reasonable Satisfaction, I shall insist a little further on it. And,

1. This might appear sufficiently from this one Consideration, (tho' no more could be produced for it.) That, still in the *Stile and Language of those Times*, the Bishop was called the *Præpositus*, the *Ruler*, the *Governour*, the *Superiour*, of all the Christians within his District, *Clergy* as well as *Laitie*: And they, without Distinction or Exception, were called *His People*, *his Flock*, *his Subjects*, &c. This may be seen almost in every one of his Epistles. Thus, Ep. 3. he says, *That Deacons ought to remember that our Lord chose his Apostles, that is, Bishops and Governours: But the Apostles chose Deacons to be the Bishop's and the Churches Ministers: And therefore a Deacon ought with all Humility to give Satisfaction to the Bishop, his Superiour*.

^k Meminisse autem Diaconi debent, quoniam Apostolos, i. e. Episcopos & Præpositos Dominus elegit: Diaconos autem post ascensum Domini in Cælos Apostoli sibi constituerunt Episcopatus sui & Ecclesie Ministros— Et ideo oportet Diaconum de quo scribis agere audacia sua penitentiam & honorem Sacerdotis agnoscere, & Episcopo PRÆPOSITO sui plena humilitate satisfacere. Ep. 3. p. 6.

And Ep. 9. He praises the *Roman Clergy* for having the *Memory of Fabianus*, who had been their Superiour, in so great Honour¹. And Ep. 13. writing to *Rogatianus* his Presbyter, and the rest of the Confessors, and praising God for their Faith and Patience, he says, That, as all Christians were bound to Rejoyce when Christ's Flock was illuminated by the Examples of Confessors; so he himself, in a special manner, as being the Bishop, seeing the Churches Glory was the Ruler's Glory^m. And in that famous

¹ In quo vobis quoque plurimum gratulor quod ejus memoriam tam celebri & illustri testimonio prosequamini, ut per vos imotescent nobis quod & vobis esset circa PRÆPOSITI memoriam gloriosum, & nobis quoque fidei ac virtutis præberet Exemplum. Ep. 9. p. 19.

^m Nam cum gaudere in hoc omnes fratres oportet, tum in gaudio communi major est Episcopi portio: Ecclesie enim Gloria, PRÆPOSITI Gloria est. Ep. 13.

Passage which I have cited already from Ep. 16. he complains of it as an unexampled Petulancy, that Presbyters should so contemn the Bishop, their Superior. And in another place, *“We Bishops, who have the Chief Power in the Church.”* And Ep. 62. *“I who, by the Divine Mercy, Govern the Church, have sent to you [Januarius, Maximus, Proculus,] &c. 1000000 Senates, as the Charitable Contribution of my Clergy and People.”* And Ep. 66. Hence spring Heresies and Schisms, &c. That the Bishop who is one, and is set over the Church, is Contemned, &c. Such was the Dialect of those Times, I say; and thus Bishops were called Rulers, Governours, Superiours, &c. and that in regard of all within their Districts, making no Discrimination betwixt Clergymen and Laicks; and not only so, but more particularly,

centum millia nummum, quæ istic in Ecclesia cui Domini indulgentia PRÆSUMUS, Cleri & Plebis apud nos consistentis collatione collecta sunt. Ep. 62. p. 147.

Inde enim Schismata & Hereses oborta sunt & Oriuntur, dum Episcopus qui unus est & Ecclesie PRÆEST, superba quorundam presumptione contemnitur. Ep. 66. p. 167.

2. It was as common in that Dialect, to call the Clergy The BISHOPS CLERGY. Thus for Example, Ep. 14. *“It was my Wish, that I might have saluted all my Clergy safe and sound, &c.”* My Presbyters and Deacons ought to have quidem F. C. taught you, &c. Because I cannot send Letters but by Clergymen, and I know that many of mine are absent. Numidicus was preserved alive by God, that he might join him to my Clergy — Urbanus and Sidonius came to my Presbyters — If any of my Presbyters or Deacons shall turn precipitant — I have sent you Copies of the Letters which I wrote to my Clergy and People concerning Felicissimus and his Presbytery — And, as I observed before, when Maximus a Presbyter, and Urbanus, &c. returned before me, they ought to have quidem F. C. written to me, &c. — Et quoniam oportuit me per Clericos scribere, scio autem NOSTROS plurimos abesse — Ep. 17. p. 39. Ep. 29. p. 55.

— Ut cum clero NOSTRO Dominus adjungeret, & desolatam per Lapsam quorundam PRESBYTERII NOSTRI copiam Gloriosis Sacardotibus adornaret. Ep. 49. p. 79.

* Urbanus & Sidonius Confessores ad Presbyteros NOSTROS venerunt. Ep. 49. p. 92.

** Interea si quis immoderatus & præceps, siue de NOSTRIS Presbyteris vel Diaconis — Ep. 34. p. 68.

* — Ad te, Exempla literarum — miseram, quæ de eodem Felicissimo & de Presbyteris eiusdem ad clerum istic NOSTRUM — scripseram. Ep. 45. p. 88.

L from

from the Novatian Schism to Cornelius's Communion, *We are Reconciled* (say they to Cyprian) to Cornelius OUR BISHOP, and to all the Clergy^a.

^a — Cum
Cornelio Epi-

scopo NOSTRO pariter & cum universo clero pacem fecisse — Ep. 53. p. 98.

Such was the Language of those Times. Now, I say, by what Propriety of Speech could a Bishop have been called *Præpositus*, Superiour to his Clergy? Could they have been called HIS Clergy? Could he have been said to have been *Their* Bishop? *Their* Ruler? *Their* Governour? By what Rule of either Grammar or Rhetorick, Logick or Politick, could he have been said to have been *set over* them, or *they* to have been *his Subjects* or Inferiours, if he had no *Power* nor *Jurisdiction* over them? If they were not *Subjected* to his *Authority*, nor *Obnoxious* to his *Discipline*? But let all this pass for meer *Profusion* if you will. I am not pinch'd for want of *Arguments*. For,

3. The three great Principles which I proved so fully before, *viz.* That a Bishop, in St. Cyprian's time, was the *Principle of Unity* to the Church which he Govern'd; that he had a *Supreme Power* in it; and that by the Principles which then prevailed, he was the *same* in the *Christian Church*, which the *High-Priest* was in the *Jewish*; and the last Thing I proved also, *viz.* That he had a *Negative* over his Presbyters; Each of these is demonstration for the present *Conclusion*, and you need not *Artificial*; *Natural Logick* is enough to let you see the *Consequences*. Indeed,

4. We find Cyprian all along both Reasoning and Practising to this purpose. Thus, he told Bishop Rogatianus, Ep. 3. That the Case was plain between him and his Deacon: He might punish him, forthwith, by his Episcopal Power, and his Ca-

^a Et tu quidem thedral Authority^a: He might make him sensible of his Episcopal Honour^a: He might Exert the Power of his Honour against him, either by Deposing, or by Excommunicating him^b: Nay, He might ravi facisti, ut malle de eo Conqueri cum pro Episcopatus vigore & Cathedræ Auctoritate haberes potestatem, qua posses de illo statim vindicari. Ep. 3. p. 5.

^a Oportet Diaconum, agere audaciæ suæ penitentiam, & honorem Sacerdotis agnoscere —

^b Quod si ultra te Contumeliis suis exacerbaverit & provocaverit, funderis circa eum potestate honoris tui, ut eum vel DEPONAS vel ABSTINEAS.

Excommunicate all such as should Rebel against him: For all these Censures, his Sovereign Authority was competent^d.

^c Et si qui a-
lii tales extite-
rint, & contra Sacerdotem Dei fecerint, vel COERCERE poteris, vel AB-
STINERE.

^d — SACERDOTALI LICENTIA — Ibid. p. 6, 7.

Thus he praises *Pomponius*, another Bishop, for Excommunicating another Scandalous Deacon, *Ep. 4. p. 9.* And did not he himself Suspend *Philumenus* and *Fortunatus*, two Subdeacons, and *Favorinus* an Acolyth, from their Livings? As we learn from his 34th Epistle.

But you may say, These Instances extend no further than to Deacons, or more inferiour Clergy-men; but, What is this to Presbyters? Why? Sir, indeed, the Instances are pat and home; and you must acknowledge so much, if you consider, that, by the Principles of those Times, there was no Disparity between Presbyters and Inferiour Orders in this respect: But the Bishop's Power extended equally to all; just as a King can censure his Chancellor, as well as a Sub-Collector of his Customs; a Justice-General, as well as a Justice of Peace: Nothing clearer from the above-mentioned Principles. But that I may leave you no imaginable Scruple, I shall even account to you about Presbyters also.

5. Then, I have told you already, how some of the *Carthaginian* Presbyters conspired against *St. Cyprian*, and used their utmost Arts to hinder his Preferment to the Bishoprick. Now, if we may believe either himself, or *Pontius* in his Life, whatever it was they did on that Occasion, he might have punish'd them for it; punish'd them not only with Deposition, but with Excommunication, had he pleased. Take first his own Account in *Ep. 43.* there he tells his People, That through the Malignity and Perfidioufness of some of his Presbyters, he durst not adventure to return to *Carthage* so soon as he would: And he describes those Presbyters thus; That being mindful of their Conspiracy, and retaining their old Grudges against his Promotion, they reinforced their ancient Machinations, and renewed their Attempts for Undermining him, by siding with *Felicissimus* in his Schism: And then he proceeds thus; I neither willed nor wished their Punishment

for their Opposition to my Promotion; yea, I Pardon'd them, and kept my Peace: And yet, now, they have suffered Con- dign Punishment: Tho I did not Excommunicate them then, their own Guilty Consciences have done it now: They have Excommunicated themselves, &c.* Take it next from Pon- tius his Deacon, *Tho I am unwilling*, says he, *yet I must speak it out*: Some resisted his Promotion, but how Gently, how Pa- tiently, how Generously, how Mercifully, did he forgive them? Did he not thereafter admit them to his most inti- mate Friendship and Familiarity, to the Astonishment of many? Indeed, he therein shewed a Miracle of Clemency. Lay these two Accounts together, and then tell me, if these Presbyters were not Obnoxious to his Discipline? If his Power over them might not have extended to their very Ex- communication, for their old Tricks against him, had he been willing to have put it in Execution? But this is not all. For,

* Hoc enim quorundam Presbyterorum malignitas & perfidia perfecit, ne ad vos ante diem Pasche venire licuisset: Dum Conjurati sunt sua memores, & antiqua illa contra Epi- scopatum me- um — ve- nena retincentes,

instaurant veterem contra nos impugnationem suam, & Sacrilegas Machinationes insidiis solitis denuo revocant. Et quidem de Dei providentia nobis hoc nec volentibus, nec optantibus, imo & ignoscentibus, & tacentibus, penas quas meruerant rependerunt, ut a nobis non egressi, ultro se ejcerent; ipsi in se, pro Conscientia sua, sententiam darent; — Conjurati & Scedisti de Ec- clesia sponte se pellunt. Ep. 43. p. 81, 82.

† Invidius dico, s.d. dicam necesse est: Quidam illi resistunt, etiam ut vinceres. Quibus tamen quanta lenitate, quam patienter, quam benevolenter indulsit, quam Clementer ignoravit, antecessimus corpostmodum & in eo nec. sarios computans, mirantibus saulsijs? Cui enim possit non esse Miraculo, tam memoriosa mentis oblivio? Pont. in Vita Cyp. p. 3, 4.

Have I not accounted already, How, when they first En- gaged in the Controversie concerning the Lapsed, he threa- ren'd them, that if they should continue to Absolve and Re- concile any more of them without his Allowance, he would Suspend them from their Office, and inflict severer Censures on them when he should return to Carthage? And have I not justified him in this, and made it manifest to a Demon- stration, that herein he did not stretch his Power too far? That he took not too much on him? Further yet.

When they resumed their Impudence, and, after a little Interruption, would needs be Absolving the Lapsed, tho he was then in his Retirement, and by consequence, had few or none of his Clergy to Consult with; yet he gave out this plain and peremptory Order, That if any of his Presbyters

of Deacons should prove so Lawless, or Precipitant, as to Communicate with the Lapsed before his Determination in the Matter, and, by consequence, without his Leave, that they should be forthwith Suspended from the Communion, and should be more fully Tried and Censured when he should return. And then,

tu aut. preceptis suis de nostris Presbyteris vel Diaconibus, siue de Peregrinis, ausus fueris ante SENTENTIAM NOSTRAM Communicare cum Lapsis, a Communicatione nostra accedat; apud omnes nos censura iustitiam temeritatis sue, quando in unum, permittente Domino, conuenerimus. Ep. 34. p. 68.

Interca si quis immodera-

Lastly, When they proceeded so far as to Commence the Schism with *Felicissimus*; mark it well, He not only gave a Delegation to *Caldonius* and *Herculanus*, two Bishops; and *Rogatianus* and *Numidicus*, two of his own Presbyters, to Judge and Excommunicate *Felicissimus* and his Partisans, as I have shewed already; but he likewise Excommunicated the five Presbyters who joyned with him, and all who should adhere to them^b. And he gave an Account of his Proceedings to all Catholick Bishops, particularly to *Cornelius* Bishop of Romeⁱ; and his Sentence was not only ratified by *Cornelius* and *Felicissimus*, and all his Party refused his Communion, but they met with the same Treatment; St. *Cyprian's* Sentence was Approved, and Confirmed by all Catholick Churches all the World over^a.

h Si quis autem penitentiam agere, & Deo satisfacere detrectans, ad Felicissimi satellitum ejus partes concesserit, & se here-

tica factioni conjunxerit; sciat se postea ad Ecclesiam redire & cum Episcopis & Plebe Christianis Communicare non posse. Ep. 43. p. 85.

ⁱ Vide Ep. 45. p. 88.

^b Legi literas tuas, F. C. — quibus significasti, *Felicissimum* hostem Christi — absentem & non tantum mea, sed plurimorum Co-episcoporum sententia condemnatum, ac te illic esse rejectum, &c. Ep. 59. p. 126.

I might easily have proved this more fully, but, I think, I have said enough. And now, Sir, lay these three Things together, viz. That there were several considerable Acts of Church Power peculiar to a Bishop, in St. *Cyprian's* time, and which those in the Order of Single Presbyters could not meddle with: That a Bishop, as such, had a Negative over all the Presbyters within his District: And, That they were all Subordinate to him, and Obnoxious to his Discipline: And then I can refer it to your self to determine, Whether

a Bishop, then, was not quite another thing than either Single Presbyter, or Presbyterian Moderator.

Thus, I think, I have sufficiently defeated our Author's Definition of a Bishop, in St. Cyprian's time, by giving a fair and just Account of him, as he stood related to his own particular Church which he Govern'd. I come now to consider him as he stood related to the Church Catholick. And here also I am very much mistaken, if I shall not find Matter enough for another Demonstration against him. I shall endeavour to dispatch this Point with all possible Brevity.

1. Then, by the Principles of the Cyprianic Age, all Bishops were Collegues, and made up One College. St. Cyprian calls them so, and speaks of the Episcopal or Sacerdotal College so frequently, (no fewer than 6 or 7 times in one Epistle, and 4 or 5 times in another¹) that I need not adduce Testimonies. Indeed, being all Men of the same Character, the same Order, the same Dignity; being all of them equally Supreme, and First in their own Churches; and all standing Collateral to one another; they were most properly called Collegues, and their Society a College, if we may rely on A. Gellius his Skill in the Latin Tongue, or rather Messala's cited by him^m. And it is observable to this purpose, That St. Cyprian no where calls Presbyters his Collegues. He calls none so, but Bishops. And the Notion of the Episcopal College had such an Impression on him, it was so Common and Received in those Times, that speaking even of Schismatical Bishops, who run one course, he calls them a College also, and quite different from the True College of Catholick and Orthodox Bishopsⁿ. Now,

ⁿ Privatus
Lambestanus

Fortunatum sibi Pseudo-Episcopum dignum COLLEGIO SUO fecit. Ep. 59. p. 132.

2. As the One Bishop was the Principle of Unity to a particular Church, so this College of Bishops was the Principle of Unity to the Catholick Church: And Jesus Christ was the Principle of Unity to the College of Bishops. I hope, not being a Romanist, you will not require that I should prove the Highest Step of this Gradation. All that remains then, is to Explain how the College of Bishops, by the Principles of those Times,

was the Principle of Unity to the Church Catholick; or, the One great Aggregated Body, consisting of all the particular Churches all the World over, whereof, their particular Bishops were the particular Principles of Unity. Neither needs this be a Laborious Task. For all that's necessary for it, is, To shew how they were so United into One College, as to make them capable of being justly denominated One Principle of Unity. Now, they were thus United by the Great and Fundamental Laws of One Faith, and One Communion.

That the One Holy Catholick Faith is Essential in the Constitution of the One Holy Catholick Church, is, even to this day, a received Principle, I think, amongst all sober Christians. But then, I say, That the Christians, in St. Cyprian's time, reckoned of the Laws of One Communion as every whit as forcible and indispensable to the Being of One Church, as the Laws of One Faith. It was a prime, a fundamental Article of their Faith, That there was but One Church; and they could not understand how there could be but One Church, if there was more than One Communion. By their Principles and Reasonings, a Multiplication of Communions made, unavoidably, a Multiplication of Churches: And by consequence, seeing there could be but One True Catholick Church, there could be likewise but One True Catholick Communion. All other Churches or Communions were False, i. e. not at all Christian Churches or Communions. These Principles, and suitable Reasonings from them, are so frequently and so fully insisted on in St. Cyprian's Writings, that to Transcribe his Testimonies to this purpose, were almost to Transcribe his Works. Now from these Principles, it follows clearly,

3. That the Grand Concern of the Episcopal College was, to Preserve and Maintain this One Communion: To Guard against all such Doctrines as destroyed, or tended to destroy, the the One Holy Catholick Faith; and all Schisms and Schismatical Methods which destroyed, or tended to destroy, the Unity of the One Church. These being the Great and Fundamental Interests of the One Church; and they being her Supreme Governours, they could not but be chiefly bound by the most Fundamental Laws of their Office to be Conscientious Conservators of these Great and Fundamental Interests. And indeed, so they

The Principles of

they believed themselves to be, as will evidently appear from the following Considerations. And,

1. They look'd upon themselves as bound indispensibly to maintain the Peace, the Unity, the Concord, the Unanimity, the Honour, (they are all *St. Cyprian's* Words) of the College it self. Every Error, every Defect, every Thing Dissjointed, or out of Tune in it, tended naturally to endanger the great Interests, for the Conservation and Procuracion of which it was instituted. For this End,

2. Because every Man, by being Promoted to the Episcopal Dignity, was, *Eo ipso*, a Principle of Unity to a particular Church, and so a Member of the Episcopal College; all possible Care was taken, that a fit Person should be promoted, and that the Promotion should be Unquestionable. Therefore, he was not to be Promoted, as I have proved, but where there was an Unquestionable Vacancy. Therefore, he was not to be Promoted, if there was any thing Uncanonical or Challengeable in his Baptism, or his Confirmation, or his Promotion to any former Order, as I have shewn also in the Case of *Novatians*. Therefore, he was Solemnly Elected in the Presence of the People. That either his Crimes might be detected, or his Merits published; because the People was best acquainted with every Man's Life and Conversation. Therefore he was to be Solemnly Ordained in the Presence of the People also. And that by two or three Bishops at fewest; (tho an Ordination perform'd by One Bishop was truly Valid;) Commonly there were more; all the Bishops of the Province.

* — Ut Plebe
presente vel
detegantur ma-
lorum Criminalia
vel bonorum
merita pradi-
centur —

*Episcopus deligatur Plebe presente que singulorum vitam plenissime in-
uit, &c. Ep. 67. p. 172. Ibid.*

3. Being thus Canonically Promoted, his first Work was to send his Communicatory Letters to all other Bishops, to give them thereby an Account of his Canonical Promotion, his Orthodoxy in the Faith, his Fraternal Disposition, &c. Thus, Cornelius was no sooner Ordained Bishop of Rome, than he instantly dispatched his Communicatory Letters to *St. Cyprian*. And no doubt, as the Custom was, to all other Bishops; at least, to all *Metropolitans*, by them to be Communicated to the

the Bishops within their Provinces: I say, to *Metropolitans*, for nothing can be clearer than that there were *Metropolitans* in St. Cyprian's time. He was undoubtedly *One* himself, and *De Cypriano Agrippino*, his Predecessor Bishop of Carthage, was *One* long before him. *Spanhemius* himself, our Author's *Diligent Searcher into Antiquity*, acknowledges it. But to return from this Digression. *Novatianus* also, tho' Illegally and Schismatically Ordained, found it necessary to send his *Communicatory Letters* to St. Cyprian, as if he had been *Ordain'd Canonically*, and in the *Unity of the Church*. So also *Fortunatus*, when made a *Schismatical Bishop* at Carthage, sent his *Communicatory Letters* to *Cornelius Bishop of Rome*. Indeed, this was never omitted.

^a *Metropolitanorum, seu Episcoporum in Urbe Matrice, vel prima sede, sua fuerunt, hac auctoritate, supra reliquas ejusdem Provinciae jura.* Spanhem. Epit. I say. ad H.E. N. T. Sec. 3. Sect. 6. p. 117.

^b Ep. 44. p. 83.

^c Ep. 59. p. 135.

4. If there was no Competition, no Controversie in the Case, the Matter was at an end. The *Promoted Bishop's Communicatory Letters* were sufficient, and he was forthwith faithfully joyned with all his Collegues, as St. Cyprian words it. ^v *Collegis omnibus fideliter junctus.* Ep. 59. p. 130. But if there was any Competitor, any Debate, then the rest of the College, before they received him as a Collegue, made further Enquiries. Sometimes they sent some from the Neighbourhood to examine the Matter: Sometimes the Ordainers were obliged to Account for the Person Ordained, and the whole Procedure of the Ordination: Sometimes both Methods were practised. We have a famous Instance of both Methods in one Case; the Case of *Cornelius* and *Novatianus*. *Cornelius*, as I have said, upon his Promotion wrote to St. Cyprian: So did *Novatianus*. Here was a Competition. Cyprian therefore, with his African Collegues, sent *Caldonius* and *Fortunatus*, two Bishops, to Rome, that upon the Place it self, where they might have the surest Information, they might enquire into the Merits of the Cause, and try the Competition. And on the other hand, the Sixteen Bishops, who Ordain'd *Cornelius*, wrote to St. Cyprian, and the rest of the Bishops of Africa, and satisfied them upon the whole Que-

Ep. 45.

tion, demonstrating *Cornelius's Title, and Condemning Novatianus*. Such Care was taken, that none should be admitted Unworthily or Uncanonically into the *Episcopal College*. But then,
Et factus est Episcopus a plurimis Collegis nostris qui tunc in Urbe Roma aderant, qui ad nos literas honorificas & laudabiles, & testimonio sua predicationis illustres, de ejus Ordinatione miserunt. Ep. 55. p. 104.

5. There was equal Care taken to purge him out of the College again, if he turned either *Heretical or Schismatical*: If he kept not close to the *Laws of One Faith, and One Communion*. If he swerv'd from these, he was forthwith refused the *Communion of the whole College*. Therefore, (says *St. Cyprian to Stephen Bishop of Rome, in the Case of Marcianus Bishop of Arles, who had joyned with Novatianus*.) The Corporation of Priests, (the *Episcopal College*) is Copious, being cemented by the Glue of *Mutual Concord*, and the Bond of *Unity*, that if any of the College shall turn *Heretick*, or attempt to divide or waste the Flock of Christ, the rest may interpose, and, as profitable and merciful Shepherds, collect our Lord's Sheep, and restore them to the Flock. And this they were bound to do by the *Fundamental Laws of One Church, and one Communion*; for, as our Martyr subjoyns, *Tho they were many Pastors, yet they all fed but one Flock*. And therefore all the Bishops in the World were bound to give the desolate Christians of Churches, whereof the Bishops had turned *Heretical or Schismatical*, the *Comfort of their Aid and Assistance*. 'Tis true, no Bishop was Superiour to another Bishop in point of *Power or Jurisdiction*, but all stood *Collateral*, as I have proved, and so no Bishop as Superiour to another, in a *straight Line*, could pass Sentence on him, as they might have done to *Presbyters*. Yet all being United into *One College*, which College was the *Principle of Unity to the Church Catholick*, it was necessary, as well as natural, that that College should be *impower'd* to take care of its own Preservation, and by consequence, they could do the *Equivalent* of a formal and authoritative *Deposition*; they could refuse the *Heretical or Schismatical Bishop* their *Communion*, and thereby exclude him from the *Episcopal College*: And they could oblige all the Christians within his *District* to aban-

y Iccirco enim, F. C. copiosum corpus est Sacerdotum concordie mutue glutino, atque unitatis vinculo copulatum, ut si quis ex Collegio nostro heresin facere, & Gregem Christi lacrare & vastare tentaverit, subveniant ceteri, & quasi Pastores utiles & misericordis, oves Dominicis in Gregem colligant. Ep. 68. p. 178.

3 Nam etsi Pastores multi sumus, unum tamen Gregem pasчимus. Ibid. — Solatium nostra epistulationis — Ibid. p. 177.

don his *Communion*, and choose another Bishop, as they valued the invaluable Priviledges of the One Church, and the One *Communion*. But then,

6. So long as a Bishop, worthily, and legally Promoted, kept the *Faith* and the *Unity* of the Church, he was *Treated*, he was *Encouraged*, he was *Consulted*, he was *Corresponded* with; in a word, Every way used as became the *Head* of a particular Church, and a *Fellow-Member* of the College. All the rest of the *Members* were bound, by the *Fundamental Laws* of the College, to *Ratifie* all his *Canonical*, nay, *Equitable Acts* of *Priesthood*, *Government*, and *Discipline*. Whosoever was *Baptized* by himself, or by his *Clergy*, with his *Allowance* was to be owned as a *Baptized Christian*, a *True Denison* of the Church, and to have the *Priviledges* of such all the World over. Every Bishop of the Christian Church, living at how great a distance soever, was bound to *Communicate* his *Dutiful Subjects*, duly attested by him; and to *Excommunicate* his *Excommunicates*. Thus, for Instance, *Cornelius* Bishop of *Rome* rejected *Felicissimus*, and all his *Retainers*; and *Fortunatus*, and all his; and would not grant them his *Communion*, because *Excommunicated* by *St. Cyprian*^b. And *Cyprian* rejected *Novatianus* and all his Party, because not in *Communion* with *Cornelius*^c. In short, By the *Laws* of the College, he that was *Injurious*, *Undutiful*, or *Disobedient* to his Bishop, was such to all the Bishops on Earth: He that set up an *Altar* against his Bishop's *Altar*, set up his *Altar* against all the *Altars* of the whole College: If a Bishop *Deposed* or *Excommunicated* any of his *Presbyters* or *Deacons*, it was not lawful for any other Bishop to *Receive* him, nor to *Absolve* him: He was still to be reserved for that, to his own Bishop, so long as he lived. He that was *Reconciled* to his Bishop, (whether he was of the *Clergy* or *Laity*), and *Restored* by him to the *Peace* of the Church, was thereby *Restored* to the *Peace* of all other Churches, and by consequence, of the Church *Catholick*. And of this we have a remarkable Instance in *St. Cyprian's* time. *Therapius* Bishop of *Bulla*, in the *Proconsular Province* of *Africa*, *Absolved Victor*, who had been a *Presbyter*, but had fallen, in time of *Persecution*, *Prematurely* and *Uncanonically*: And yet, by a *Synod* of *Sixty six* Bishops, whereof *Cyprian* was One, the *Absolution* was

^b Ep. 59. p. 136.

^c Ep. 44.

was Ratified, and Victor was allowed their Communion; as we learn from their *Synodical Epistle* ^a. So Eminent and Confiderable was a Bishop then, as he stood related to the Catholick Church. Let me only add one Thing more in pursuance of his Dignity, as to this Relation; and that is,

^a — *Librato apud nos, diu, Consilio, satis fuit Objurgare Therapium Collegam nostrum, quod temere hoc fecerit — pacem tamen quomodocunque a Sacerdote Dei Jesum datam, non putavimus auferendam, ac per hoc Victori communicationem sibi concessam usurpare permisimus. Ep. 64. p. 158.*

7. That so long as a Bishop continued a *sound* Member of the College, all Informatory, Consultatory, Recommendatory, Communicatory, Congratulatory, Apologetick, Testimonial; in a word, all Letters concerning the Peace, the Unity, the Government, the Discipline of the Church; or the Concord, the Correspondence, the Harmony, the Honour, the Hazards, or any other considerable Interest of the College, were directed to him, or received from him, as having the Supreme Power of the Church which he Govern'd.

All the great Concerns of both the Catholick Church, and the Episcopal College, were, in those Times, transacted by Letters. There was no possibility of General Councils then: All that could be done, was either to meet in *Provincial Synods*, upon great Emergencies; or, if that could not be neither, to transact Matters, and bring them to a General Determination, by particular Letters from Bishop to Bishop.

Provincial Synods were ordinarily kept twice a Year; and by them, in the ordinary Course, all Matters of Moment were Determined; and so by the Reciprocation of Synodical Letters, Matters came sometimes to such a General Agreement and Determination, as, in the Result, was fully Equivalent to the Definition of a General Council. We have several Instances of such Transactions by *Provincial Synods*. Thus in the Grand Case of the *Lapsed*, in the time of the Decian Persecution, the Matter was so managed by *Provincial Synods* in Africa, Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, &c. that at last, as St. Cyprian tells us, it was brought to this General Conclusion, That the *Lapsed* should complete their Terms of Penance, and should not be restored to the Peace of the Church before the Time

appointed by the Canons, unless it was in the case of Deadly Sick-
ness. Thus, without doubt, also that considerable Canon Ep 55. p. 102,
mentioned by St. Cyprian in the Synodical Epistle, which is the 103.
67th in Number, amongst his Epistles, viz. That the Lapsed,
however they might be restor'd to the Communion of the Church,
should never be received into Holy Orders. And that other Ca- Ep 67. p. 174.
non mentioned by him also, That no Clergy-man should be Tutor
to Minors &c. Thus also, long before St. Cyprian, the great Ep. 1. p. 1.
Controversie concerning the Observation of Easter, was ma-
naged in many Synods, as Eusebius tells us^h. And a few Years^h Vide Euseb.
after his Martyrdom, the Case of Paulus Samosatenusⁱ. These H. E. l. 5. c.
Instances are only for a Sample. c. 23. ad c. 28.

When Provincial Synods could not be kept, or emergentⁱ Euseb. l. 7.
Matters of Consequence could not be conveniently deter- c. 30.
min'd in them, then Recourse was had to the only remaining
Method, viz. particular Letters from Bishop to Bishop. And to
make this Method both sure and effectual, all possible Pains
was taken. It was necessary that each Bishop should sign his
Letter, and send it, not by every common Carrier, but by a
Clergy-man^k. In short, They had such Marks, that it was
not easy, if possible, to Counterfeit them. And the Bishop
who received it was bound by the Laws of the College to
transmit it, for his Share, to the rest of the Members. And
so it went through, and the whole College was acquainted^p Ep. 29.
with the Accident, the Case, the Controversie, whatever it
was that had Emerged, we have many Instances and Eviden-
ces of this Method and Diligence in St. Cyprian's Writings.
Thus, e. g. When Caldonius writes to Cyprian concerning
some Lapsed within his District, Cyprian returns him an An-
swer, telling him, He had written his Mind to that purpose
already, and so sends him Copies of five Epistles concerning
the Case, requiring him to transmit them to as many Bishops as
he could; adding this as the Reason, That One Course, One Reso-
lution, might be kept by all the College^l. And so we find, that^l Librum tibi
the Letters written by him about that Controversie were cum Epistolis
transmitted from hand to hand, till they were dispersed all numero quinque
missi — Quo

Epistole jam plurimis Collegis nostris misse placuerunt, & rescripserunt se quoque nobiscum in
eodem Consilio secundum Catholicam fidem stare; quod ipsum etiam tu ad Collegas nostros, quos
potueris transmittes; ut apud omnes unus Actus, & una Consensio secundum Domini precepta te-
neatur. Ep. 25. p. 50.

^m Ep. 55. p. 102. the World over^m. Thus, I say, sometimes the greatest Affairs of the Church were managed: And, 'tis plain, this Method was every way *Equivalent*, if not *Preferable*, to a *General Council*: So that the *Christian Church* might have still *subsisted*, and its *Unity* been *provided* for, and preserved in all Ages, without such *Councils*, as it was, effectually, during the *First Three Centuries*. Now, that which I am principally concerned for in all this Matter, is,

That all these *Circular Letters*, of whatsoever Nature, relating either to the great Interests of the *Catholic Church*, or of the *Episcopal College*, were regularly directed only to the *Bishops*, as being the *Heads*, and *Principles of Unity* to their respective Churches, as well as written and sent by those of the same *Order*. And we have a notable Account of this in *St. Cyprian's* 48th Epistle directed to *Cornelius*; for there we learn, That the Presbyters and Deacons of the Church of *Adrumetum*, having received *Cornelius's* Communicatory Letters, directed to *Polycarpus* their Bishop; and, seeing their Bishop was absent, finding it necessary that they should return an Answer, in his Name, as having his presumed Allowance for it, they wrote to *Cornelius* in the common Form, acknowledging him as *Bishop of Rome*, and subjoyning *Polycarpus* his Name to the Letter: A clear Evidence, That where there was a *Bishop*, it behoved all the Letters that concerned the publick State of the Church to be *subscribed* by him, no other Name but *his* could give them Force, and make them Current. Well! but there was one Thing amiss: *St. Cyprian*, and the rest of the *African Bishops* having Intelligence of the Competition that was at *Rome* between *Cornelius* and *Novatianus*, and being unwilling to do any thing rashly, had determined to continue to write only to the *Roman Presbyters* and Deacons, as before, during the Vacancy; till *Cornelius* his Title should be fully cleared to them. This the Clergy of *Adrumetum* were ignorant of when they wrote the above-mentioned Letter. And being afterwards told it by *Cyprian* and *Liberalis*, they directed their next Letter not for *Cornelius*, but for the *Roman Presbyters* and Deacons. Hereat *Cornelius* was not a little stumbled, and, according to the then current Principles, interpreting it to be a *disowning* of him as *Bishop of Rome*, he wrote a Letter of Complaint to *Cyprian* about it,

it, who was then *Metropolitan* of that *Province*. In Answer to which, our Holy Martyr wrote a full Apology to him, shewing him what was true Matter of Fact: Upon what Reasons the Bishops of *Africa* had taken the aforesaid Resolution: How it was in consequence of that Resolution, that the Clergy of *Adrumetum* had changed their Direction: And how, by the whole Method, nothing was less intended than to disown him as Bishop of *Rome*, or Invalidate his Title. And was there not here as clear an Evidence, that Regularly, and in the current Form, all Letters were directed to the Bishop? Shall I give you another History to clear this Matter further? When *Maximus* and *Nicostratus* retaining to *Novatianus*, and so separating from *Cornelius*, did thereby cut themselves off from the Communion of the Church; *Cyprian* wrote to them, as well he might, considering that his Design was to Reconcile them to their True Bishop *Cornelius*. But how did he write? Why? so, as that his Letter should not be delivered till *Cornelius* should see it, and judge whether it was proper to deliver it. Such a special regard was then paid to the Bishop of a Church, as being Supreme in it, and the Principle of Unity to it. Ep. 47.

If all this doth not satisfy you, then listen a little further, and resist this Evidence if ye can: Because, by the Fundamental Principles of One Faith, and One Communion, every Heretical and Schismatical Bishop was, *ipso facto*, out of the Church; and all who retain'd or adhered to him, whether Bishops, Clergy, or Laicks, did run the same Risque with him: Therefore, so soon as any Bishop turned Heretick or Schismatick, the Catholick Bishops of the Province, especially the *Metropolitans*, formed Lists of all the True, Orthodox, and Catholick Bishops, within their respective Provinces, and sent them to other *Metropolitans*: And so they were transmitted all the World over. That their Communicatory Letters, and theirs only, might be received, and their Communion, and theirs only, might be allowed; and that all Heretical or Schismatical, or Retainers to Heretical or Schismatical Bishops, might be rejected, and their Communion refused. And for this we have two notable Testimonies from St. *Cyprian*, the one is in his 55th Epistle directed to *Cornelius*, where he tells him, That upon *Fortunatus* his starting out of the Church, and pretending to be Bi-

Bishop of Carthage, He had sent him the Names of all the Bishops in Africa, who Govern'd their Churches in Soundness and Integrity, and that it was done by common Advice: But to what purpose? That you and all my Collegues may readily know to whom you may send, and from whom you may receive Communicatory Letters. The other Testimony is in Ep. 68. where Cyprian having given his Sentiments fully concerning Marcianus; that he had forfeited his Dignity; and that it was necessary, that another should be substituted in his room, &c. requires Stephen Bishop of Rome to give himself, and the rest of the Bishops of Africa, a distinct Account of the Person that should be Surrogated in Marcianus his Place, That we may know, says he, to whom we may direct our Brethren, and write our Letters P.

o ——— Et
miserim tibi
proxime nomina
Episcoporum
istic constituto-
rum qui inte-
gri & sani in
Ecclesia Catho-
lica fratribus
presunt. Quod
utique ideo de
omnium nostrorum Consilio placuit scribere; ut erroris diluendi — compendium fieret, & scire-
tu & Collegae nostri, quibus scribere, & literas mutuo a quibus vos accipere oportet.
Ep. 59. p. 132.

P Significa plane nobis quis in locum Marciani Arelate fuerit substitutus, ut sciamus ad quem fratres nostri dirigere, & cui scribere debeamus. Ep. 68. p. 179.

I have only given you a Taste of the Methods and Experiments which were put in Practice in those Times, for preserving the Unity, the One Communion of the One Catholic Church; and how nicely and accurately it was provided for, by the Incorporation of all Bishops into Our College; of all particular Principles of Unity of particular Churches, into one Aggregated Principle of Unity, proportioned to the Extent of all those Churches in their Aggregation: And by the mutual Support of all Bishops one towards another. It had been easy to have collected more Particulars, as well as to have insisted more largely on these I have collected: But from the small Collection I have made, I think I have laid Foundation enough for another Demonstration against our Author's Notion of a Bishop in St. Cyprian's time. For,

How could either Single Presbyter, or Presbyterian Moderator, taking the Terms in the Presbyterian Sense, have born such a Part, in relation to the Unity of the Catholic Church, and the Preservation of One Communion? Besides, that the College of Bishops, in those Times, is still considered and insisted on, as consisting of Church Governours notoriously distinguished from Presbyters: Besides, that in all St. Cyprian's

Writ.

Writings, or in any Monument of those Times, you shall never, so much as once, find a *Bishop* calling a *Presbyter* his *Colleague*: Besides, that we have not the least Vestige of any such stated, ordinary current Office, in any Record of those Times, as that of a *meer Presbyterian Moderator*: Besides these Things, I say,

How had it been consistent with the Principles or Analogies, the Scheme or Plot of *Presbyterian Parity*, to have committed to any *Single Presbyter, Moderator*, or other, the bearing of such a Part, as that *He, and He alone*, of God knows how many, should have been Constituted a *Member* of a *College*, which *College*, and which *alone*, had the *Supreme Power* of Preserving the Faith, and the Unity, and managing all the Affairs of the Church Catholick? As that all his *Admissions* into the Church; his *Exclusions* from the Church; his *Extrusions* out of the Church; his *Suspensions*, his *Abstentions*, his *Excommunications*, his *Injunctions* of Penances, his *Absolutions*, his *Ordinations*, his *Degradations*, his *Depositions*; in a word, all his *Acts* of Government and Discipline, within his own *District*, and *his alone*, should have had Authority, and been deemed Valid, and merited a Ratification all the World over? As that whosoever, *Presbyter* or other, within such a District, in which there might have been many *Decads* of *Presbyters*, was *Disobedient* to him, or *Top't* it with him, or *Rebelled* against him, should have been reputed *Disobedient* to, and *Rebellious* against, the *whole College* of the *Supreme* Governors of the Church Catholick? As that raising an *Altar* against his *Altar*, and *his only*, should have been deem'd *Raising* an *Altar* against all *Catholick Christian Altars*? As that from *him*, and from *him only*, in the regular Course, all *Communicatory*, *Informatory*, *Consolatory*; in short, all *Letters* concerning the *Publick Affairs* of the *Catholick Church*, or the *Sacred College* that Ruled the *Catholick Church*, should have been *Received*? As that *to him*, and *to him alone*, all such *Letters* have been *directed*? As that by the *Circulation* and *Reciprocation* of *Letters* betwixt *him* and *his Collegues*, and their *General Agreement* upon any Thing, by that *Circulation* and *Reciprocation*, *Laws* should have been given to the whole *Catholick Church*, *Canons*, as *Binding* and *Obligatory* as the *Supreme Ecclesiastical Power* on *Earth* could make them?

The Principles of

How could one raised to such a Post, I say, have been no other than a *Single Presbyter*, or a *Presbyterian Moderator*? Doth not his very bearing such a Part, his having such a *Trust*, his being Cloath'd with such an *Eminence*, argue him Demonstratively to have been something *Other*, something *Greater*, something *Higher* and more *Honourable* than either?

Thus I have considered a *Bishop* in *St. Cyprian's* time, as he stood related to his own Particular, and to the Church Catholick; and, in both respects, have discovered a vast Discrepance betwixt him, as he was really, and our Author's Notion or Definition of him. Let me only add one Consideration more; and that is,

What Character he bore, what Figure he made, in the Eye of those who were *without*; of the *Heathen World*, especially the *Roman Emperours* and *Magistrates*. And here I need not be at much Pains; the Thing is Obvious: The Christian Bishops, as being the *Chief Rulers*, the *Supreme Governors*, the *Heads* of their respective Churches, were the *Chief Butts* of all the *Heathen Rage* and *Malice*. Take these few of many Evidences.

After *St. Cyprian* had retired from *Carthage*, in the time of the *Decian Persecution*, he wrote to his *Presbyters* and *Deacons*, and told them how earnest he was to return to the City, but Prudence would not let him. When he considered the Publick Peace of the Church, and how much he, as *Bishop*, was concerned to Provide for it, and for the Quiet and Safety of the Brethren, he found it necessary for him, tho' with mighty Grief, to forbear returning for a time, lest HIS PRESENCE should provoke the Rage and Fury of the Gentiles. So he wrote, I say, in his 7th Epistle^a. And in the 12th, directed also to his *Presbyters* and *Deacons*, I wish, says he, that my Station and Character, would allow me to be present with you^r. In his 20th Epistle directed for the Roman *Presbyters* and *Deacons*, he Apologizes for his Retirement after this manner. In compliance with our Lord's Commands, (pointing, no doubt, at *Matth. 10. 23.*) so soon as the Persecution began, and the Rabble, with mighty Clamour, pursued

*q. Oportet nos
tamen paci
communi consu-
lre, & inter-
dum deesse vo-
bis, ne PRÆ-
SENTIA
NOSTRI
INVIDIAM
ET VIO-
LENTIAM
GENTILIUM*

PROVOCET. Ep. 7. p. 14.

*ⁱ. Atque utinam LOCI & GRADUS mei con-
ditio permitteret, ut IPSE PRÆSENS esse possim, Ep. 12. p. 27.*

me,

me, I retired for a time, not so much to save my self, as for the publick Quiet of the Church; and that the Tumult which was already kindled, might not be the more inflam'd by MY OBSTINATE PRESENCE. And to the same purpose, he Apologizes to his own People for his so long Absence, Ep. 43. Tho he had been long away, yet he durst not return, because of the Threats and Snares of these perfidious Men, (*Felicissimus*, and his Fellow-Schismaticks,) Lest, says he, upon MY COMING, there should be a greater Uproar and, while as a Bishop ought, in all Things, to provide for Peace and Tranquillity, I should seem to have added Fuel to the Sedition, and to have imbittered the Persecution.

Nam sicut Domini mandata instrunt, orte statimurbationis impetu, primo, cum ME clamore violentius, populus flagitasset, non tantam salutem quam quietem fratrum publicam cogitans, interim secessi ne per INVERECUNDAM PRÆSENTIAM NOSTRAM, seditio qua caperas, plus provocaretur. Ep. 20. p. 42.

Accessu huic tæfescenti animo nostro Dolor major, quod in tanta sollicitudine, ac necessitate, excurrere ad vos IPSE non possum; dum per minas & per insidias perfidorum Cavemus, ne ADVENIENTIBUS NOBIS Tumultus illic major oriatur; & cum paci & tranquillitati EPISCOPUS Providere in omnibus debeat, IPSE materiam Seditioni dedisse, & Persecutionem exacerbasse videatur. Ep. 43. p. 83.

Here, I think, is clear Demonstration of the Episcopal Eminence in the Eye of the Heathen Persecutors: It was a Grief, a Burden, a Torment, a very Crucifixion to St. Cyprian's Soul, to be separated from his Flock, as himself words it. But he was bound by the Laws of his EPISCOPAL PROVIDENCE, by all means, to study the Peace, the Quiet, the Tranquillity of the Church, and his LOCUS and GRADUS, his Station and Dignity, were so Conspicuous and Eminent, that HIS PRESENCE would have provoked the Gentiles, and increased the Persecution, and therefore he durst not return. And yet this is not all. Consider if what follows is not yet clearer.

In his 14th Epistle written to his Presbyters and Deacons, he tells them, That tho he had strong and pressing Reasons to hasten his return, yet he found it more expedient and useful for the publick Peace to continue longer in his Lurking Places; and Tertullus, one whom they knew, and could not but value, had seriously advised him to be Calm and Cautious, and not to commit himself rashly to the publick View, especially of that Place where he had been so often lain in wait, and made search for; and therefore he Exhorts and Commands them, (his Presbyters

and Deacons,) That *THEY*, whose PRESENCE was neither so INVIDIOUS, nor by far so DANGEROUS, might perform the part of Vicars to him*. Here, I think, we have a full Evidence of a fair Discrimination was made betwixt him and his Presbyters by the Heathen Persecutors. And not only so; but,

* — a-Ter-
tullo — qui
etiam hujus
Consilii auctor
fuit, ut cautus

& moderatus existerem, ne me in conspectum publicum, & maxime ejus loci ubi toties flagitatus & qualisuis fuisset, comere committerem. Fretus ergo Dilectione & Religione vestra, quam satis novi, his literis & Hortor & Mando ut VOS quorum minimè illic INVIDIOSA, & non adeo PERICULOSA PRÆSENTIA est, VICEM MEAM sum-
gamini, &c. Ep. 14. p. 31.

** — in
tempestate pro-
scriptus, appli-
cito & adjuncto
EPISCOPA-
TUS SUI NO-
MINE, toties
ad Leonem pe-
titus, &c.
Ep. 59. p. 130.

* Si quis tenet
vel possidet de
bonis Cæcilii

Cypriani Epi-
scopi Christianorum: Ut etiam qui non credebant Deo Episcopum constituti, vel Diabolo creden-
tibus Episcopum proscribenti. Ep. 66. p. 166.

* Vide Pont. in vita Cyp. p. 9, 10.

He tells *Cornelius* Bishop of *Rome*, Ep. 59. That he was *Proscribed* in the Days of the *Decian* Persecution, and that by *Name*, as *Bishop of the Christians in Carthage*, and that he was destin'd for the *Lions*, &c.¹¹ And again, Ep. 66. he tells *Florentius* *Pupianus*, That his *Proscription* ran in this *Form*: If any *Man* holds or possesses any of the Goods of *CÆCILIVS CYPRIANVS BISHOP OF THE CHRISTIANS*, &c. And thereby makes an *Argument*, that it was *Unaccountable* in *Florentius* not to own him as a *Bishop*^x. And *Pontine* his *Deacon* tells us, That, when he at last commenced *Martyr* in the *Valerian* Persecution, in the very *Sentence* that was given out against him, he was called *SECTÆ SIGNIFER*, the *Ring-leader*, the *Head*, the *Chieftain* of the *Sett* of the *Christians in Carthage*^y. Would you have yet more? Then,

scopi Christianorum: Ut etiam qui non credebant Deo Episcopum constituti, vel Diabolo creden-
tibus Episcopum proscribenti. Ep. 66. p. 166.

Take it, not about *St. Cyprian's Person*, for I think we have enough of him already, but in *St. Cyprian's Words*: You have them Ep. 55. there he tells *Antonianus*, That the Emperours *Decius* (from a Sense, no doubt, that, as *Heads* of their respective Churches, they were, under God, the great Supporters and Promoters of our Most Holy Faith,) had such a *Spire*, such a *Pique*, at the *Christian Bishops*, that for Example, He could have heard with greater *Patience and Composure*, that another *emulous Prince* should have *Rivall'd* it with him for
the

the Roman Empire, than that a Bishop should have been settled in the City of Rome^a. And doth not Eusebius tell us, That the Emperour Maximinus, in that Persecution of which he was the Author, some 22 or 23 Years before St. Cyprian's Martyrdom, Ordered, that the *Aggravus*, the chief Governours of the Christian Churches, should only be put to Death, as being the Authors of the Propagation of the Gospel^a? So Eminent, in those Times, was the Episcopal Character; such a Sense had the very Heathens of their being Bishops indeed; so much, as Bishops, Dei Sacerdotes were they Obnoxious to the Fury and Malice of Persecutors; and so much Reason had St. Cyprian to say, That it mattered not, whence (whether from Heathens without, or Schismatics within, if they may be called any way within) Terrors or Perils threatened a Bishop, seeing, as such, he was still obnoxious to Terrors or Perils^b. Meaning, that, in those Times, Bishops, as Bishops, were still exposed to the first burnt of all Persecutions. As, on the other hand, when the Human Galienus, who succeeded to Valerianus, stop'd the Persecution which his Predecessor had begun, he began his Imperial Rescript, thus, The Emperour Publius Licinius Galienus, &c. To Dionysius, Pinnas, Demetrius, and the rest of the BISHOPS, &c. and so went on, telling them, How he had ordered his Edict of Grace and Clemency to be Published all the World over; allowing them to rely upon it, as full Security against all Molestation for the future^c. Thus, I say, that Heathen Emperour stopping the Current of a fierce Persecution, and designing Favour and Security to Christians, directed his Letters to the Christian Bishops, as the Persons who were Heads of the Christian Churches, and in all Persecutions had wont to be exposed to the greatest Hazards.

^a Cum multis patientius atque tolerabilius audiret levare adversus se amulum principem, quam constitui Romae Dei Sacerdotem. Ep. 55. p. 104.

^a Τὸς ἡὺ κακιστῶν Ἀρχιερέων ὡς ἄντις καὶ τοῦ Εὐαγγελίου διδασκαλίας, ἀναιρεῖσθαι. Euseb. H. E. l. 6. c. 24.

^b Nec interest unde Episcopo aut terror aut periculum veniat, qui terroribus & periculis vivit obnoxius. Ep. 59. p. 126.

^c Αὐτοκράτωρ καίσαρ Πάσις Λαγυ Γαλιηνός, &c. Διογνησιῶ καὶ πιννα καὶ διονυσίῳ καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς ἐπίσκοποις, &c. Euseb. l. 7. c. 13.

Thus, Sir, I have examined our Author's Definition of a Bishop in St. Cyprian's time; and, if I mistake not, have demonstrated by many solid Arguments, that he was neither Single Presbyter, nor Presbyterian Moderator, in the Presbyterian Sense of the Terms; but a True Prelate in the strictest propriety of Speech. Consider my Arguments thoroughly, and weigh them only in the Balance of Justice, without Prejudice, and

and without *Partiality*, and try whether *Each* of them *single*, and much more, *all together* do not *Conclude* irrefragably against him. And if they shall be found to be *Concludent*, I leave it next to *you* to *Determine*, whether our Author is not both *fairly* and *formally* bound by his *Word* to *confess* himself a *Schismatick*.

When I first put Pen to Paper, I had in my Project to have proceeded further, and made it appear as evidently, as what I have now dispatched, That the *Episcopal Prebeminence* which was so notoriously and unquestionably *Prelatical* in St Cyprian's time, was no *Novel Usurpation*, no *Late Invention*, not at all the *Production* of the *Cyprianic Age*, nor any *Age* later than the *Apostles*: That St. Cyprian, and all his *Contemporaries*, firmly believed it to be of *Divine Institution*; That they had not *Entertained* it, having so little *Temporal Encouragement*, nay, so great and many *Temporal Discouragements* to *Entertain* it, if they had not so believed: That they had great *Reason* for this their *Belief*; as *fairly* founded on our Saviour's own *Ordinance*; and *fully* handed down to them in the *constant Practice* of the *Universal Church* from the *First Plantation* of *Christian Churches*: That it pass'd amongst them as a *common Principle*, That *Bishops*, as I have represented them, *Bishops*, as they were then, that is, clearly *contradistinct* from *Presbyters* and *Superiour* to them, *Bishops* as the *Heads* of, and *Principles* of *Unity* to, their respective *Churches*, were the *Rightful*, *True*, and *Genuine Successors* of the *Apostles*, in the *Supreme visible Ecclesiastical Power* of *Governing* the *Churches*, whereof they were *Bishops*.

These Things, I say, I had once in my Prospect; but this *Letter* has swell'd to such a Bulk already, as, perhaps, may fright you from Reading it: And you may Command me to Prosecute what is left undone, when you will: And what I have written, as I said, seems to me sufficient, in Point of Argument, for bringing your Author to a *Sense* of his *State*, as well as a *Candid Confession* of it, when 'tis thus plainly represented to him: And therefore I Conclude with my Best Christian Wishes to you and him, and all Men.

March 28. 1695.

F I N I S.

Advertisement.

T *Here is now in the Press, and will be
Published by Michaelmas next, [An
Enquiry into the New Opinions (chiefly)
propagated by the Presbyterians in Scot-
land. By A. M. D.D.]*

Advertisement

There is now in the Press, and will be
Published by Michaelmas next, [An
Library into the New Opinions (chiefly)
propagated by the Presbyterians in Scot-
land. By A. M. D. D.]

Don

A
VINDICATION
OF A
DISCOURSE

ENTITLED

The *Principles* of the *Cyprianic Age*,

With regard to

Episcopal *POWER* and *JURISDICTION*:

Being a Reply

To Gilbert Rule's *Cyprianic Bishop Examined and found not to be a Diocesan.*

WHEREIN

Besides a great many Things more briefly Considered, The usefulness of fixing the Principles of the *Cyprianic Age* is succinctly Represented; The main Controversie between those of the Church and the Presbyterians is fully and distinctly stated; Mr. Rule's main Subterfuges are utterly overthrown; Large Supplements are added to the Principles of the *Cyprianic Age*; The *Cyprianic* Episcopacy is shewn to be inconsistent with a Papacy; And it is Demonstrated that Episcopal Government was universally delivered to be of *Divine Right* in the Days of St. *Cyprian*.

— Οὗς δὲ ἐμποιεῖται — Tit. I. II.

L O N D O N:

Printed by G. Croom for Robert Clavel at the Peacock at the West end of St. Pauls, and George Strahan at the Golden-Ball overagainst the Royal Exchange. MDCCI.